Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Post-Graduate and Research Department Series, No. 31

MAHĀBHĀṢYADĪPIKĀ
OF
BHARTṚHARI

Fascicule V : Āhnika II

critically edited by
G. B. Palsule

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
POONA, INDIA
1988

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
POONA, INDIA

MAHĀBHĀṢYADĪPIKĀ
Fascicule V : Āhnika II

Printed at the Bhandarkar Institute Press
and
Published by R. N. Dandekar, Secretary,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Poona 411 004.

भर्तृहरिविरचितायां

महाभाष्यदीपिकायां द्वितीयमाह्निकम्

महाभाष्यदीपिकायां द्वितीयमाह्निकम्

अइउण् ॥ १ ॥

[१] अकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः। स्पृष्टतादयश्चत्वार आभ्यन्तराः प्रयत्नाः सवर्णसंज्ञायाः प्रवृत्तौ च निवृत्तौ च व्याप्रियन्ते। तत्राकारः संवृतः आकारो विवृत इति सावर्ण्यस्याभावात् आकारोऽसति ग्रहणे कार्यं न प्रतिपद्येत, अतो विवृतोपदेश आश्रीयते। ननु च नियतप्रयत्नत्वात् वर्णानां स्थाननियमवत्, यथा नियतस्थानत्वादशक्य इकारस्त्वोष्ठाभ्यामुच्चारयितुम् अकारो वा दन्तेन, एवं संवृतोऽकारः कथमिव शक्यो विवृत उच्चारयितुम्? उच्यते। कश्चिदेव प्रयत्नो न शक्यते कर्तुं वक्त्राप्रमादात्। अयं तु संदष्टादिवत् शक्यतेऽप्रमादात् कर्तुमिति। अतश्च शक्यते, यत् विवृतोपदेशश्चोद्यते।

[१.१] तत्राकार इति कारशब्दः प्रत्ययो "वर्णात् कारः" (पा. ३. ३. १०८ वा. ३) इति। वर्णवाचिनो वर्णात् स्वार्थे वर्णाभिधेयतायां (? वर्णाभिधायिनोऽयं) प्रत्यय इति। वाक्यस्थेनाकारेण सूत्रस्थः 'अइउण्' इत्यकारो व्यपदिश्यते। अथ ककार इति कथं प्रत्ययः? न ह्य[यं] वर्णः। किं तर्हि? वर्णसमुदायः। नैष दोषः। एवमर्थमेवेदमुपन्यस्तम्, 'वर्णाभिधायिनोऽयं प्रत्यय' इति। व्यञ्जनमशक्यमनच्कमुच्चारयितुमिति साच्काद्वर्णाद्वर्णाभिधायिनः कारप्रत्ययः। प्रतिपाद्यमानस्त्वनच्क एव प्रतीयते। यथा जिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयावुपस्थितौ खकारः फकारश्चोच्चार्येते, प्रतिपन्नौ तु शुद्धावेव।

[१.२] ननु च कारप्रत्ययस्य नित्यत्वात् "अस्य च्वौ" (पा. ७. ४. ३२) इति निर्देशानुपपत्तिः। अकारस्य च्वाविति भवितव्यम्। उच्यते। वाच्यवाचकभेदेऽविवक्षिते स एवायमित्येकत्वाध्यवसाये वर्णवाचित्वं नास्तीति प्रत्ययाभावः। अथ वास्मादेव निर्देशादनित्यः प्रत्ययः इति प्रतिपत्तव्यम्।

[१.३] अकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः। विवृतशब्दस्य सापेक्षत्वात् असामर्थ्ये सत्युपदेशशब्देन समासानुपपत्तिः। उच्यते। विवृतस्य गुणत्वात् गुणस्य गुण्यपेक्षत्वमव्यावृत्तमित्यपेक्षावान् प्रवर्तते। समुदायविशेषणं वा सद् वृत्तस्यावयवमपि संप्रक्ष्यति।

किं च। गमकत्वं तत्रोक्तम् "इह गम[क]त्वाद् वृत्तिर्भविष्यति" (मभा. २. १९. ११)। अथ वा विवृतेनोपदेश इति "साधनं कृता ...." (पा. २. १. ३३ वा. २) इति समासे कृते स विवृतोपदेशोऽकारस्येति दोषाभावः।

[१.४] अथ किमर्थमिदमुच्यते "अकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः" इति, यावता सूत्रोच्चारणादेवाधिगतमनेन विवृतोऽयमकार इति। कश्चिद्विशेषः शब्दगतोऽभ्यासादेव गम्यते। यथोदात्तादिर्वेदाध्यायिनामेव प्रसिद्धः, तथा ऋषभ[:], गान्धार इति गान्धर्वाणामेव। एवमयं विवृतो दुर्वेद्योऽ[न]भ्यासादित्यतः कथयति, विवृतोऽयमुपदिष्ट इति।

[१.५] अन्ये मन्यन्ते। अयमपि प्रत्याहारे कृतप्रत्यापत्तिरेव पठितः। अयं तूच्चार्याश्रवणार्थमकारं प्रत्याययति संवृतः प्रतीयते। यथा 'ष्ठा गतिनिवृत्तौ' (पा. धातु. १. ९७५), "धः कर्मणि ष्ट्रन्" (पा. ३. २. १८१) इति च कृतष्टुत्व उच्चार्यमाणो लक्ष्यविषयं प्रतीयमानं स्था इति [त्र]न्निति चैवंरूपं प्रतिपादयति। तस्मिंश्च प्रयोगविषये एव रूपे ष्टुत्वस्यासिद्धत्वात् धात्वादिविकारः प्रवर्तते। तत्र कृतप्रत्यापत्तावश्वार्कादिषु तेषां कस्यचिदेवानुकरणो व्यक्तिपक्षे। आकृतिपक्षे तु सामान्यमनुक्रियते। तत्राक्षरसमाम्नायिकस्य प्रत्या[पत्तौ] सर्वे कृतप्रत्यापत्तय इति नैव भवत्यादिशब्दे रूपसिद्धौ प्रत्यापत्तिमुपादित्सन्ति।

[१.६] अन्ये मन्यन्ते। नैवायमनुकरणो न च कृतप्रत्यापत्तिः कस्यचित् प्रतिपादकः। किं तर्हि? अनर्थक एवायमकृतप्रत्यापत्तिर्विवृत उच्चारित इति।

[१.७] किं प्रयोजनम्? आकारग्रहणार्थः। नन्वेवं निर्देष्टव्यम्, 'आकारग्रहणम्' इति। उच्यते। ....

[१.८] [उच्यते।] कदाचिद्धर्मी धर्मव्यपदेशकः। तद्यथा – विषाणी, ककुद्मान्, प्रान्तेवालधिः, सास्नावानिति। तद्वानेत्र व्यपदिश्यमानो विशेषं प्रतिपद्यते, ह्रस्व इति। एवं दीर्घ इति। एवं च त्रिचतुर्मात्र इति। तत्र यस्यामवस्थायां करणसंनिपाताद् ध्वनिर्ध्वन्यन्तरमारभते तदोपरत एवास्यव्यापार इति युक्तमुच्यते – बाह्यश्च पुनरास्यात् काल इति। अथाप्याद्य एव यत्नः प्रतिपद्यते, यथा शर्करोन्मज्जनेन रेचकादिकर्मणि, बाह्य एव य आक्षेपविशेषस्त[त] एव प्रवृत्तिरित्येवमर्थं प्रयुज्यमानो नाभिप्रदेश एव वायोः प्रकारप्रयत्नमारभ्यत इति कालस्या[स्याद्] बाह्यत्वमस्त्येव।

[१.८.१] ननु चेदं विरुध्यते " तप[र]स्तत्कालस्य " (पा. १. १. ७०) इति। एवं हि तत्रोक्तम् " स्फोटस्तावानेव " (मभा. १. १८१. २१) केवलं वृत्तिभेदः। ततश्च सर्वासु वृत्तिषु तत्कालत्वम् इति इहापि ह्रस्वदीर्घयोः कालस्य तुल्यत्वात् खट्वाभिरिति भवितव्यमैस्-भावेन। उच्यते। नैष दोषः। [नित्यत्वा]भ्युपगमात्। एवमर्थमेव शब्दानां नित्यत्वमभ्युपगम्यते। तस्य नित्यस्य पुनर्येऽभिव्यञ्जकास्ते च केचित् प्राकृताः, केचिद्वैकृताः। यः करणसंनिपाताद् उत्पद्यते, यश्च तस्मात्, तौ प्राकृतौ। ताभ्यां विशेषोपलब्धेः। यस्तु ध्व[नि]तो ध्वनिरुत्पद्यते, स वैकृतः, ततो विशेषाभावात्। केवलं तु स एवमुपलब्धिकृत् इति। एष विशेषः – यदि [दीर्घप्लुतेषु] शब्दान्तराभावाद् भिन्नकालत्वम्, द्रुतमध्यमविलम्बितास्वपि भिन्नकालत्वम्। अथ दीर्घप्लुतेषु पुनः पुनः करणाभिघातः तद्द्रुतादिष्वेवं सति कालस्यास्या[द्वा]-द्यत्वं दुरुपपादं, करणाभिघातस्यानुपरमादिति।

[१.९] किं पुनरिदम् इति। किमिदमपूर्वं पाणिनि[ना] विवृतत्वमकृतमुपसंख्यायते, उत कृतस्यान्वाख्यानमिति। यदयम् ' अ अ ' (पा. ८. ४. ६८) इति .... प्रत्यापत्तिं शास्ति। यदीह संवृत एवाकारः प्रतिज्ञातः स्यात्, किं तस्य प्रत्यापत्त्या ? तत्र प्रत्यापत्तिवचनादवसीयते विवृतोऽकार इति, यश्च प्रत्याहारे, यश्चानुवृत्तिनिर्देशे ' अस्य च्वौ ' (पा. ७. ४. ३२), ' अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः ' (पा. ६. १. १०१) इत्येवमादिषु, यश्च प्रयोगशब्देष्वश्वार्कार्थादिशब्देषु। अस्ति ह्यन्यदेतस्य वचने प्रयोजनम्। अयमभिप्रायः। ' अ अ ' इति योऽयं संस्कारशब्दोऽयं प्रयोगशब्देष्वेवाकारस्योपपद्यते, नानर्थकानां प्रतिपादकशब्दानाम्। अयं च वक्तृप्रमादजो दोषोऽस्त्येव वि[वृ]तत्वम्। आतश्चास्ति यत् पाणिनिना कृतमिति। एवमतिखट्वादिषु प्रयोगशब्देषु विवृतत्वमुच्चारयेत्। तस्मात् प्रत्यापत्तिरुच्यते।

अथ च न विवृत उपदिष्टः स्यात्, तत्र चोद्यते – न चेत् प्रत्याहारेऽनुवृत्तिसंदेशे(? °त्तिनिर्देशे)षु चाकारो विवृतस्तत्र प्रयत्नभेदात् नाप्याकारः सवर्णो नापि तदादेशः। असावर्ण्यादग्रहणे सति स्थान्यादेशयोरच्त्वाभावः। [न] स्थानी [अच्], नाप्यादेश इति कस्य प्रत्यापत्तिः ? उच्यते। लिङ्गादिदमवसीयते भवत्याकारस्य अकार इति, यदयमित्त्वे " .... आतः स्थाने यकपूर्वायाः " (पा. ७. ३. ४६) इत्याह। न " केऽणः " (पा. ७. ४. १३) ह्रस्वत्वमन्तरेणाकारोऽस्ति; यस्माल्लिङ्गात् विकलाङ्गा परिभाषा नोपतिष्ठेत इति च " ऊकालोऽज् ह्रस्व .... " (पा. १.

२. २७) इति च यकपूर्व आ। [य]द्येवम्, इदं कस्मान्न कल्प्यते, लि[ङ्गा]त् सावर्ण्यमस्तीति ? यदि च सावर्ण्यम्, किं विवृतेन प्रत्यापत्त्या वा ? उच्यते । लिङ्गमनुमानपक्षः । [न] सर्वत्रानुमानात् प्रतिपत्तिरिति विशिष्टविषयमनुमानं प्रतिपद्यामहे । सावर्ण्यं नास्ति लिङ्गात् । किं तर्हि ? आदेशमात्रमिति । अथ वा गोस्त्रीग्रहणं तत्र कृतम् । तत्र स्त्रीग्रहणमनवकाशमिति प्रवर्तेतादेशो, न तु सावर्ण्यमिति ।

त(? अ)त्रान्तर्य[त] इति । वक्तुः प्रमादजोऽस्य[न्त]रतम इत्यभिप्रायः । नैव लोके न [च] वेदे इति । एतदुक्तं भवति । भवतोक्ता दोषा वक्तृप्रमादजाः सन्ति । [न] तावतां निवृत्त्यर्थं प्रत्यापत्तिर्वक्तव्या । सन्ति दोषाः कलादयः । न च तद्विषयास्ति प्रत्यापत्तिः । ते हि गर्गादिबिदादिपाठादेव निवर्तिताः । एवमकारस्यापि प्रयोगस्थस्य विवृतत्वं निवर्तितं गर्गादिबिदादिपाठादेव । तस्मात् पाणिनिरेव विवृतत्वं प्रतिजानीते इत्यस्यैव लिङ्गं प्रत्यापत्तिः । कः पुनरत्र विशेष इति । वाक्यगतं व्यापारं पृच्छति । वाक्ये हि कल्प्यत्वात् वाक्यशेषस्य, कर्तव्य इति वा कृत इति वा नास्ति कश्चिद्विशेष इति । न खलु कश्चिद् ... आहोपुरुषिकामात्रं तु । अहंपुरुष इत्युच्यते [अहोपुरुषः], आत्मसंभावितः, परस्मादुत्कृष्टमात्मानं यो मन्यते, अहंकारवान् । तस्य भाव इति मनोज्ञादिदर्शनाद् वुञ् । आहोपुरुषिकेति अहंयुत्वमुच्यते । भवानाह इति । न सम्यग् भवतोक्तम्, मयैव तु यदुक्तं तदेव युक्तं प्रत्यापत्तिवचनादिति ।

[१.१०] तस्माद् (? तस्य) विवृतोपदेशात् (वा. २) । आक्षरसमाम्नायिकः अनर्थको विवृतः कृतप्रत्यापत्तिः, यः शास्त्र एव ' अइउण् ' इत्यस्य प्रतिपादकः । यथा ' वर्तमाने लट् ' (पा. ३. २. १२३) इति नोच्चार्यमाणस्येत्संज्ञा, किं तर्हि ? वर्णविक्रियाविषयस्य बुद्धिस्थस्य । स त्वनेन प्रतिपाद्यते । अथ चानुकरणोऽयं समुदायस्थानां द्रव्यवच्चोपदेशे कस्य[चि]देवानुकरणं स्यादितीदमुच्यते – धात्वादिस्थस्यापि विवृतोपदेशः कर्तव्यः । इतरथा हि प्रयत्नभेदात् आक्षरसमाम्नायिकेनाग्रहणात् असत्यच्त्वेऽस्थानित्वात् शाम्यतीति दीर्घो न स्यात् । प्रातिपदिकस्यान्तोदात्तो भवतीत्येतन्न स्यात्, दृषदिति । प्रत्यये चायक इत्यायादेशो न स्यात् । अवगत इति स्वरो न स्यात् । यदयम् ' अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः ' (पा. ६. १. १०१) .... इति । अयमनुबन्धेन चिह्नेन ज्ञायते, स एवायमाक्षरसमाम्नायिक इति । यदि धात्वा[दि]स्थश्च न गृह्येत, एतावत् ब्रूयात् ' इकः सवर्णे दीर्घः ' इति । न हि [द्वयो]राक्षरसमाम्नायि-

कयोर् इति । यद्यपि एको[पि] नास्ति, तथापि द्विविषयत्वाद्दीर्घस्येदमुक्तम् । [तदर्थम् ।] आकारार्थमेतत् स्यात्, स हि विवृतत्वात् सवर्णो भवतीति । **क एष यत्न[श्] चोद्यते विवृतोपदेशो नाम** । एतदेवाह – कोऽत्रादरो यावता धातवः पठ्यन्त एव । न च ते पठ्यमानाः संवारेण विवारेण वा किंचित् गौरवं लाघवं वा जनयन्तीति । **यान्येतानि [प्रातिपदिकान्य]ग्रहणानि** । य एते रङ्कादयो लोके प्रयुक्ता एतेषु संवृतोऽकारः प्रयुज्यते । शास्त्रे चैषामुच्चारणं नास्ति । न चोच्चारणमन्तरेण शक्यं विवृतत्वं प्रतिज्ञातुम् । **सति चोपदेशे गुरु शास्त्रं भवति** । तस्मादिदं पठितव्यम्, **धात्वादिस्थश्च विवृत इति** । अथ धातुग्रहणं किमर्थम्, यावता पठ्यन्त एव धातवः ? उच्यते । प्रातिपदिकार्थं चेदिदमारभ्यते, तद्धात्वर्थमपि भविष्यति । ततश्चोच्चारणे संवृता एवोच्चारयिष्यन्ते, कार्ये तु विवृता इति ज्ञास्यन्ते । एवं च सति करणविगमोऽप्याख्यातुं न भवतीति ।

[१.११] दीर्घप्लुतवचने च संवृतनिवृत्त्यर्थः (वा. ३) । केचिद्वर्णयन्ति – आक्षरसमाम्नायिकस्यैव विवृतोपदेशे द्वितीयं प्रयोजनमन्वाख्यायते । तस्य संवृतत्वाद्दीर्घप्लुतावान्तरतम्यात् संवृतौ प्राप्नुतः । केचिद्धात्वादिस्थस्य विवृतोपदेशे प्रयोजनमाचक्षते । अत्र चेदं चोद्यते – संवृतत्वाद्दीर्घप्लुतस्यानच्त्वात् स्थानित्वानुपपत्तिरिति । **नैव लोके न च वेदे** इति । शिष्टप्रयोगं हेतुमाह । न हि शिष्टाः दीर्घप्लुतौ [संवृतौ] प्रयुञ्जते । **स्थानी प्रकल्पयेदेतौ** इति । निर्वर्तकमिदं लक्षणमिति एवं केचित् मन्यन्ते । इहभवन्तस्त्वाहुर्यथैव शिष्टा अन्तस्थाः सानुनासिकाः प्रयुञ्जते, इह तु स्थानेन्तरतमपरिभाषाश्रयणात् भवति प्रतिपत्तिः, अनुज्ञातोऽस्मिन् विषयेऽनुनासिक इति । एवं यद्यप्यत्र दीर्घप्लुतौ संवृतौ न स्याताम्, तदान्तरतम्यात् स्यादनुज्ञा, इति । विषम [उ]पन्यासः । **[युक्तं यत्] सतस्तत्र प्रक्लृप्तिर्भवति** । अने[ने]दमाह – अशक्यत्वादिति । इह किंचित् शक्यम्, यथा हस्ताभ्यां शक्येत गन्तुम्, न तु शिरसा । एवं चाकारो दीर्घः प्लुतो वाशक्य एव संवृत उच्चार[यि]तुं सर्वेण लोकेन । [अ]नियताश्च वर्णदोषाः । एवं ह्युक्ताः – स्वरदोषभावनाः । अतोऽन्ये व्यञ्जनदोषाः (मभा. १. १३. २६–२७) इति । अन्तस्थास्तु शक्यन्त उच्चारयितुं सानुनासिकास्तत्रापि रेफोऽशक्य इति । द्वौ हेतू व्यपदिष्टौ, शिष्टाप्र[यो]गोऽशक्यत्वं च । **एवमपि कुत एतत्** । अथोच्यते, संवृतश्चेदकार ईकारोकारयो[र्वि]वृतत्वात् तुल्यप्रयत्नत्वं कुतः ? एवं ह्युक्तं ‘ विवृतं करणं स्वरोष्मणाम् ’ इति । तत्र वर्णयन्ति – ‘ ऋवृतः संवृता अन्यत्राभवसाम्नः ’

इति । ए[त]च्चासत् । पार्षदकृतिरेषा । अस्यामेव शाखायामार्भवं मुक्त्वा सामान्तरे न विवृतत्वम्, अन्येषां तु विवृता एव । तस्मादयमर्थः । एवमपि कुत एतद् इति। विवृतेऽपि सत्यकारस्य न सिध्यति । अकारो हि विवृतः, आकारो हि विवृततरः, इकारोकारौ तु विवृततरावपि । तत्र तुल्यप्रयत्नाभ्यामेव भवितव्यम् । यद्येवं ग्रहणमपि न प्राप्नोति । वचनाद् ग्रहणं भविष्यति । अथ वा, विवृतोपदेश एतदुक्तं भवति, वि[वृ]ततरोपदेश इति । तत् कथं 'संध्यक्षरेषु यदत्रावर्णं विवृततरं तदन्यस्मात्' (मभा. १. २५. १४) इति ? एतदपि विवृततममिति प्रतिपत्तव्यम् ।

[२] तत्रानुवृत्तिनिर्देशे सवर्णाग्रहणमनण्त्वात् (वा. ४) । 'अइउण्' इत्यपरः । 'अकः सवर्णे ....' (पा. ६. १. १०१) इत्यन्यः । शुद्ध एव 'अस्य च्वौ' (पा. ७. ४. ३२), 'यस्येति च' (पा. ६. ४. १४८) इति । तत्रानुबन्धेन प्रतिपद्या[महे], स [ए]वायमिति । शुद्धेषु तु नास्त्यण्त्वम् । तत्र यथैवाकारः प्रत्याय्य एव नित्यं न तु प्रत्यायकः, एवमयमप्यकारः प्रत्याय्य एव । तेनायमेव कार्यं प्रतिपद्येत, शुक्लीभवति । मालीभवतीति न स्यात् । एवं चौडिः, बालाकिरिति ।

[२.१] एकत्वात् [अकारस्य] सिद्धम् (वा. ५) । अनुवृत्तादत्वात् ।

[२.२] अनुबन्धसंकरस्तु (वा. ६) । वस्तुतोऽका[र]स्याभेदाच्च । एवं 'कर्मण्यण्' (पा. ३. २. १) इत्यस्य । एवं च 'आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः' (पा. ३. २. ३) इति । यथैव च मुण्डेन कृते चौर्ये कुन्तली संपन्न इति न च [न] गृह्यते चोर इति । तत्र गोद इति परत्वात् कः स्यात्, उत्तरार्थं कित्करणम् । अथ वानवकाशत्वात् पर्यायः स्यात् ।

[२.३] किरिणा गिरिणेति । अकारो नोदाह्रियते, 'न गोश्वन्साववर्ण....' (पा. ६. १. १८२) इति प्रतिषिद्धत्वात् । **घटेन तरति** इति । केवलं द्विरुच्चारणं, वस्त्वेकमिति । ठंस्तु बाहुकादिषु कृतार्थः ।

[२.४] द्रव्यवच्चोपचाराः (वा. ८) । न ह्येकेन घटेन एककालम् **अनेकः कार्यं करोति** घृताद्याहरणादि । अकारं अश्वात्कारवर्तिनमुच्चारयति ।

[२.५] विषयेण तु नानालिङ्गकरणात् (वा. ९) । वाक्यकारः सामान्यं करणं निर्दिशति, भाष्यकारो भेदमधिकरणभावं च वीप्सासप्तमीभ्यां कथयति । **एकमेवायं सर्वगुणमुच्चारयेत्** । कर्मण्युपपदे कण्[ट्] प्र[त्ययो] भवतीति ब्रूयात् ।

यावतो वा शक्नोत्युच्चारयितुं तावत उच्चारयेत्। अन्यांस्तु लुप्तनिर्दिष्टान् प्रतिजानीत इति। आयम्य हि द्वयोरेवेत्संज्ञा [स्या]त्। इत्संज्ञैव शास्त्रापेक्षया आय[च्छ]तीत्येककर्तृक[त्वस्य] सिद्धत्वात्। तत्रा[पि] द्वयोरित्संज्ञा, अन्तरालपतितानां तु नैव स्यात्। विषयेण [तु] पुनर्लिङ्गकरणात् सिद्धम्। ननु च नियमार्थमेतत् स्यात् – तत्कृतमेव भवति, न ञ्नित्कृतमन्तोदात्ता(? °माद्युदात्ता)दीति। विधेयेऽसति नियमो विज्ञायत इति इदमेव ज्ञास्यते, अन्यत्र तत्कृतं न भवतीति। इतरथा ह्येवं वक्तव्यं ‘ शिवादिभ्यः अ ’ इति। लोकत एतत् सिद्धम्। नैवमुच्यते, एकमेवायं सर्वगुणमुच्चार[येदि]ति। कथं तर्हि ? शब्दवत् यत्र लिङ्गं कार्य आश्रीयते, तल्लोके तल्लिङ्गस्यैव भवति। चौर्ये तु मुण्डादयोऽशब्दवन्तः। तत्र यथैव मुण्डादयो (?) न कर्तव्यमिति तत्र शिखी जटी वा कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते, एवमिहापि कार्यार्थमनुबन्धासङ्गास्तेन तस्मिन् तस्मिन् विषये तत्तत् कालं(? यं) लप्स्यन्ते इति। ‘ अ सांप्रतिके ’ (पा. ४. ३. ९) इत्यत्र किमर्थं णित्कृतं न भवति ? न ह्यस्मिन् किंचिदस्ति लिङ्गमित्यनियमः प्राप्नोति। उच्यते। ‘ मध्यान्मोऽसांप्रतिके ’ (पा. ४. ३. ८–९) इति पर्युदासेन सिद्धे निरनुबन्धाश्रयणमेवमर्थम्, अनुबन्धवियोग एव लिङ्गं कथं स्यादिति। तत्र यथैव कश्चिदुच्यते, ‘ इह नग्नो भव ’ इति, एवं ‘ निरनुबन्धको भव ’ इति नियुज्यते।

[२. ६] आवृत्तिसंख्यानात् (वा. १०)। इह लो[के] यत्र मुख्या संख्या ... [सप्तद]शत्वं संपद्यते तत्र चावृत्तावनियतविषयायामुच्यते ‘ त्रिः प्रथमामन्वाह त्रिरुत्तमामन्वाह ’ (तै. सं. २. ५. ७) इति। प्रथमोत्तमे आवृत्तिसंख्ये इति। भवेदावृत्ति[तः] कार्यं यत्रानेकत्वमाश्रीयते। यत्र त्वेकत्वमेव तत्र स्वाश्रयस्यानिवृत्तत्वात् प्राप्नोत्येव स्वरः, किरिणा गिरिणेति। एतदपि सिद्धम्। [संख्या] संख्यान्तरेणात्यन्तं निवर्त्यते, गौणेन मुख्येन वा। यथा शास्त्रे नैधेय इति सति स्थानि[व]त्त्वे, त्र्यच्कोऽयमिति द्व्यच्क[त्वे] बाधिते, ढकोऽप्राप्तिरितीदमुदाह्रियते ‘ पूर्वविधाविति किमर्थमिदम् ’ (मभा. १. १४२. २३) इति। तद्यथा। ऋषिसहस्रमेकां कपिलामेकैकश इति। ऋषिसहस्रमिति सामानाधिकरण्य एकैक[शः] इति साक्षात् संबन्धः। षष्ठीसमासे वा सामर्थ्यलक्षणः संबन्धो भुजिवत् इति। ते हि परस्परं वित्तेन स्वीकृत्य सहस्रकृत्वो ददुः। एतच्च दानं स्वीकृतस्य वस्तुनः परित्यागः। तत्रैकस्या अपि दा[ना]त् ‘ सहस्रदक्षिणा आनीयन्ताम् ’ इत्ये[ते]ऽप्यानीयन्ते,

'एकदक्षिणा आनीयन्ताम्' इत्येते नानीयन्ते। यथैवात्र संख्या निवर्तिकैव पूर्वसंख्याया एवमिहापि इति दोषाभावः।

[३] आन्यभाव्यं तु कालशब्दव्यवायात् (वा. ११)। साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यामयं हेतुः। प्रसिद्धनानात्वैः साधर्म्यम्, प्रसिद्धैकत्वैश्च वैधर्म्यम्। इह शब्दव्यवायो – येषां सिद्धं नानात्वम् – तेषां दृष्टः। तद्यथा – दृतिरिति ऋकारेकारयोस्तकारेण। इहापि दण्ड इति दकारे योऽकारः डशब्दे च, तयोर् 'ण्ड्'शब्देन व्यवायो दृष्टः। एकस्य चात्मनो [ऽयं] धर्मो नास्ति। यदायमकारः शुद्ध उच्चार्यते अ इति, तदा नास्त्यस्य शब्देन व्यवायः। तथा पौर्वापर्यं कालव्यवेतमसंहितायां प्रसिद्धनानात्वेष्वेव दृष्टम् अ इ उ इति। न त्वेकस्यात्मनोऽकारस्य [शु]द्धस्योच्चारणविषये कालभेदो विद्यते। इह तु दण्ड अग्रमिति असंहितायामस्ति पौर्वापर्यं कालव्यवेतम्। तस्मात् नाना अकारः। ननु शब्दव्यवायेऽप्यस्ति कालव्यवायः, तत्र कालव्यवाय इत्येव सिद्धम्। उच्यते। कालव्यवाय एव द्वेधा प्रदर्शितः – शब्दशून्यः, शब्दवांश्च।

[३.१] युगपद्देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनात् (वा. १२)। देशपृथक्त्वेनाकारस्य दर्शनं युगपदस्ति। अयमेकत्वविरोधी धर्मः। न ह्येको देवदत्तो युगपद् देशपृथक्त्वेनोपलभ्यते। अकारस्तूपलभ्यते। तस्मादनेकोऽका[र] इति। अन्यत्वे हेतुद्वयमुपन्यस्तम्। एकस्य परिहारमाह – यदुच्यते भवता 'कालशब्दव्यवायात्' इति, अत्र ब्रूमः – यदि पुनरिमे वर्णाः शकुनिवत् स्युः इति। एतदुक्तं भवति – योऽयं व्यवायः परिकल्प्यते भवता कालशब्दाभ्याम्, नायं वस्तुनो व्यवायः। किं तर्हि? व्यञ्जकस्य निमित्तस्य प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिभ्यामुपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धी एते। यद् अभिव्यञ्जकनिमित्तत्वमका[र]स्य तद् वर्णान्तराभिव्यञ्जके निमित्ते प्रवृत्ते अप्रवर्तमानं नोपलम्भयति अकारम्, पुनः प्रवर्तमानमुपलम्भयति। तस्मादुपलब्ध्यनुपलब्ध्योः प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिभ्यामिदं भवति, न तु वस्तुनो भेदात्। यथा शकुनिः पङ्क्तावस्थित आशुसंपातित्वात् स्थानान्तरं गच्छेत्। किं तत्र शक्यते वक्तुम्, स शकुनिः पूर्वः परश्च वस्तुतो भिन्नः शकुन्यन्तरेण व्यवहित इति? एतत्तु शक्यते वक्तुम्, पूर्वमनुपलब्धः संप्रत्युपलब्धः इति। एवं च कृत्वेदमाह – एवमयमकारो द इत्यत्र दृष्टो द इत्यत्रोपलब्धः ण्ड इत्यत्र दृश्यते [उ]पलभ्यते। नैवं शक्यम्। अनित्यत्वमेवं स्यात्। अस्त्ययं तर्काश्रितः समाधिः। शास्त्रसिद्धान्तस्तु न भवति। शास्त्रे ह्यर्थवतः शब्दस्य नित्यत्वं प्रतिज्ञातम्, पदस्य वाक्यस्य वा। स च समुदायोऽभ्युपगतः शास्त्रे। समुदायश्च वर्णात्मक एव।

तत्रैकत्वप्रतिज्ञाने कर्कः, स वर्णसमुदायो नास्ति । ककारो द्विरुपलब्धोऽकारश्च, रेफश्च सकृदिति शक्यं वक्तुं कर् इत्येवंलक्षणः समुदाय इति । एवं कारुक इत्ययमपि कारु इत्येवंलक्षणः । अस्य च प्रयोगाभावाद् अर्थवत्तैव नास्ति । तस्मादभ्युपगन्तव्यमेतत्, अवस्थिता एवामी समुदाया अर्थेषु, भिन्नैरेव वर्णैरनुगता इति । **यदि तु पुनरमी वर्णा आदित्यवत् स्युः** । युगपद्देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनादित्यस्य व्यभिचारः । एकस्यापि आ[दि]त्यस्य देशपृथक्त्वेषूपलब्धिः दृष्टा । तत्राकारो देवदत्ते नरात्मनि पुनरादित्ये नेति विषमहेतुरिति (?) । **विषम उपन्यासः** । एतदाचष्टे – एवं मयोक्तम्, न देवदत्तमेको द्रष्टा युगपत् देश[पृथक्त्वे]षूपलभते । आदित्यमपि च नोपलभते । यो ह्युपलब्धा साकेते, नासावेव सौराष्ट्रिके । यो वृक्षस्योपरिष्टादादित्य.... उपलभते । **अकारं [पुन]रुपलभते** । यस्यापि च क्षणविषयमुपलब्धियौगपद्यं नास्ति, तस्याप्यादित्यस्योप[ल]ब्ध्या विसदृश्युपलब्धिरकारस्य, मुहूर्तविषयस्योपलब्धियौगपद्यस्य संभवात् । न चाकाशमेकम् । तस्मात् एकदेशत्वमकारस्यानुपपन्नम् । **अकारमपि नोपलभते** । यद्यकारस्य भेदाः स्युरुपपद्यते पृथक्त्वम् । तथैक एव देशः शब्दस्याप्याकाशः । तस्मादहेतुरयं ' युगपद्देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनात् ' इति । **श्रोत्रोपलब्धिर्बुद्धि[नि]र्ग्राह्यः प्रयोगेणाभिज्वलितः** । किमर्थमेतदुपादीयते ? उच्यते । [अ]व्यभिचारिणां धर्माणां प्रदर्शनार्थम् । श्रोत्रोपलब्धित्वमव्यभिचरितमिति । न जातुचित् चक्षुषा दृश्यते । तथा बुद्धिनिर्ग्राह्यत्वात् नान्येन निर्गृह्यते । ध्वनिना व्यज्यमानो न प्रदीपादिभिरभिव्यज्यते । एवमाकाशमव्यभिचारि । तस्मान् [नान्यभाव्यमकारस्य] । या त्वेकदेशस्य सतः पृथग्देशस्योपलब्धिः, सा निमित्तकारणवशात् । यथा दूरादिव्यपदेशः, दूरः शब्दः संनिकृष्ट[ः] शब्दः इति । करणव्यापारजनिता या बुद्धय[स्] ता एकस्य चानेकत्वमपि दर्शयन्ति, यथाभोगवति स्थाने शब्द उच्चारिते तत्सदृशं शब्दान्तरमिहोपलभ्यते । बुद्धयो ह्यनवस्थिताकाराः प्रवर्तन्त एवेति । इदं त्वयोक्तम् ' न ह्येको देवदत्तो युग[प]त् स्रुघ्ने च भवति [मथुरायां च] ' । अत्र ब्रूमः – पृथिव्या एकत्वात् तदिह यो देवदत्तः कस्मान्न स्रुघ्नः कस्मिंश्चिन्मथुरेति(?), एवमाकाशस्याप्येकदेशत्वे सति देशबहु[त्व]व्यवहारः प्रवर्तिष्यते । **आकाशदेशा अपि बहवः** । ननु च पृथिवी स्वैरवयवैरारब्धेति तत्रावयवा देशत्वेन युक्ताः । अनारब्धं च पुनराकाशम् । सत्यम्, एवमेतत् । ते त्ववयवा अतदात्मानः सन्तः समवायित्वाद् व्यपदिश्यन्ते । एवं किं न गृह्यते वृक्षादिभिः संयोगाद् इहाकाशमिति व्यपदिश्यते । एतावांस्तु विशेषः – समवायिनो देशा वस्तुसंप्रमोहहेतुना समवायेनैकात्म्यमिव नीताः । आतश्च नीता यदनित्यत्वमपि केचित् प्रतिपन्नाः ।

अवयवावयविनो देशव्यवहारे तु नास्ति कश्चित् प्रतिविशेषः । तस्माद् देशबहुत्वात् स्थितो हेतुः, ' युगपद्देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनादान्यभाव्यमकारस्य ' इति ।

[४] आकृतिग्रहणात् तु सिद्धम् (वा. १३) । प्रत्याहारे अनुवृत्तिनिर्देशे च जातिरेव चोद्यते, न व्यक्तिः। व्यक्त्युपादानं तु यथा नालिकेरद्वीपनिवासिनः (? °ना) इदमुपदिश्यते – अयं गौरेष त्वया न पदा स्प्रष्टव्य इति। स तं बालं कृष्णं कृशं चोपदिष्टो वृद्धं शबलं स्थूलमपि न स्पृशति। तस्यास्त्वाकृतेर्न व्यवधानं व्यवच्छेदो [वा]। विवृतत्वम्, ये चान्ये धर्माः, सर्वे ते व्यक्तिद्वारकाः। तत्र प्रत्याहारे विवृताकृतिरुपदिष्टा, तस्या एव च शास्त्रान्ते प्रत्यापत्तिरिति सर्वं सिद्धम्। यत्र त्वाकारग्रहणे जातिनिर्देशादकारग्रहणं प्राप्नोति। तत्तु न च प्राप्नोति, प्रयत्नभेदात्। यथा ' पूर्ववया ब्राह्मणः प्रत्युत्थेयः '। प्लुतस्य तु प्राप्नोति। तत्रापि परिहारः ' प्लुतश्च विषये स्मृतः ' (पा. ६. १. ८७ श्लो.वा. २) इति।

[४.१] तद्वच्च तपरकरणम् (वा. १४) । ' तथा च तपरकरणम् ' इत्येतदुक्तं भवति, ' तद्वच्चेति ' । [सवर्ण]ग्रहणेनातिप्रसक्तमिति । प्रत्याख्यातेऽपि हि योगे तपरकरणं सं[दि]ह्यत एव – किं व्यक्तौ पदार्थे प्रापकमथाकृतौ निवर्तकमिति। अतो यथैवाकृतिग्रहणे प्रत्याख्यानम्, तथैव तपरेष्वप्याकृतेर्ग्रहणमिति ।

[४.२] हल्ग्रहणेषु च (वा. १५) । तत्र ग्रहण[क]शास्त्रस्याव्यापारः । व्यक्तिनिर्देशकस्तकारो निर्दिष्टः प्रत्याहारे तत्रत्यानुकरणम्। एकस्यासौ स्यात्, पूर्वस्य परस्य च (? वा)। तत्र 'झलो झलि' (पा. ८. २. २६) इति पूर्वपराश्रयो लोपो न स्यात्। क तर्हि स्यात् ? यत्र भिन्नरूपौ झलौ ' अबुद्ध ' ' अबुद्धाः ' इति । आकृतिनिर्देशे तु तकाराकृतेर्निर्देशात् सिद्धो लोपः ।

[४.३] रूपसामान्याद्वा (वा. १६) । कथमयं परिहारः ? तत्र केचिद् वर्णयन्ति – यद्यप्याकृतिर्नैव स्याद्, एवमपि न दोषः। यथा कार्षापणादिष्वसत्यां जातौ। भवतावत् मधुरा कार्षापणमस्ति (?)। अथ चार्थवस्त्वेव तत्तथाभूतं यत् तत्त्वाव्यवाये(? °यो) भवति । एवं च (? न) तावत् शब्दाकृतिरिति । इहभवन्तस्त्वाहुः – आकृतेरेव रूपसामान्यात् सिद्धम् इत्येवमयमुपात्त इति । तत्रैतत् स्यात्, वक्तुं (? उक्तं) तदाकृतिग्रहणात्तु सिद्ध(? °द्धं) इति। तच्च न। पूर्वमेवमुक्तम् -- आकृतिः शब्देनाभिधीयत इति, तत्राकृतेश्चोद्यमानत्वात् सिद्धम्। इदानीं तु व्यक्तीनां

चोद्यमानत्वात् यद्यपि व्यक्तय उपदिश्यन्ते, नाकृतिरुपदिश्यते, एवमपि सिद्धम्। कथम् ? इदं तावदयं प्रष्टव्यः – यदेतदन्यत्वम्, किमेतदुच्चारणात् शब्दस्य, अकारादयमिकारोऽन्यः इति; अथ विशेषात् कस्माच्चित् ? विशेषादित्याह। स एवायमिति चान्य इति च तत्त्वान्यत्वे निमित्तात् कस्माच्चित् पदार्थः प्रतिपद्यते। एवं चेत् किमर्थमाकारस्य भवान् विशेषादन्यत्वं प्रतिपद्यते, न पुनः सामान्यात् स एवायमिति ? स्यान्मतम् – लोके भेदेनैव व्यवहारो नाभेदेनेति। एतच्च न। अभेदेनापि लोके व्यवहार इति – तानेव शाटकान् आच्छादयाम इति। तस्मादाकृतिरनभिधीयमानापि अस्ति त[त्त्व]स्य प्रत्त्या(? प्रति)पत्तौ निमित्तमिति एतदाचष्टे।

ऋलृक् ॥ २ ॥

[१] किं विशेषेण लृकारोपदेशश्चोद्यते ? उक्तं हि प्रयोजनं सर्ववर्णोपदेशेऽविशेषेण। अतस्तदेवास्य प्रयोजनं भवितुमर्हति। अथ वा विशेषेण वैधर्म्येणेति। अन्ये हि वर्णा अन्येन प्रकारेण चोद्यन्ते। अकारो विवृतत्वेन, रेफहकारौ पूर्वपरोपदेशेन, [अं]तस्था अणसूपदेशेन। अयं तु विशेषेणोच्यते इति। अल्पीयांश्च प्रयोगविषय इति। एतदाचष्टे – वर्णानामु[प]देशः शास्त्रप्रवृत्त्यर्थः। शास्त्रं च प्रयोगार्थम्। स च प्रयोगो नास्ति लृकारस्येति। अल्पीयानित्य(? °त्यृ)वर्णविषयः प्रकर्षः। [ऋ]कारस्याल्पः प्रयोगविषयः। तस्मादल्पतरोऽस्येति। स्यादेतद् – योऽसौ प्रयोगविषयस्तदर्थ उपदेशः कर्तव्य इति अत इदमाह – यश्चापि प्रयोगविषयः सोऽपि क्लृ[पि]स्थस्यात् (?°स्थस्यैव)। कृपेश्च लत्वमासिद्धम्। तत्र यान्यच्-कार्याणि उदात्तादीनि, तानि ऋकारव[स्था]यामेव लब्धानि। नार्थः लृकारोपदे[शे]न।

[१.१] यदृच्छाशक्तिजानुकरणप्लुत्या[द्य]र्थः (वा. १)। यदुक्तम्, प्रयोगार्थं शास्त्रम्, न च प्रयोगे लृकारो विनिवेशितस्वरूपो विद्यते इति। यदृच्छादिष्वस्ति लृकारप्रयोगः। यदृच्छा नाम या असति प्रवृत्तिनिमित्ते अर्थगतं (?° ते) प्रवर्तकं [निवर्तकं] वा नियमहेतुमन्तरेण प्रवर्तते निवर्तते वा सा यदृच्छा। डित्थशब्दो हि स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धनो यत्र यत्र प्रयुज्यते, 'इदं तावदस्य नामधेयं करोमी'ति, तत्र तत्र [प्रवर्तते। अन्यतश्च] निवर्तते। स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धनानां च शब्दानां तस्य स्वरूपस्य रूपान्तरेण प्रत्या[य]यितुमशक्यत्वान्नास्ति निवर्तकं शब्दान्तरम्। तत्र लृतकशब्दो नामधेयत्वेन नियुज्यमानोऽनपेक्षितबाह्यनिमित्तोऽसति निवर्तके

शब्दान्तरे स्वरूपनिबन्धनः साधुः । स किमिति न प्रयुज्यते ? तस्मात् ऌकारवतः शब्दस्य प्रयोगाद् अच्कार्यप्रसिद्ध्यर्थं कर्तव्य उपदेशः, यदि तन्नास्ति ‘ ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः ’ इति (पा. १. १. ९ वा. ५) । सति हि तस्मिन् ऌकार एव अच्कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते । **चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः** इति । अनेन एतत् कथयति । केचित् शब्दा नियतार्थाः । पर्यायाश्चैषां शब्दानां नियताः । अनुत्पाद्याः पुरुषेण, कर्तुरस्मरणा[द्] त्र । अस्ति तु स शब्दग्रामो, यो नामधेयत्वेन नियुज्यमानः कस्मिंश्चिदर्थेऽनियतः पौरुषे[ये]ण व्यापारेण नियुज्यते ।

[१.२] तत्र जातिशब्दो यदा जातौ प्रवर्तते, तदा[न]पेक्षितनिमित्तवत्त्वाच्छक्यते वक्तुं स यदृच्छाशब्द इति । अन्यान्या (? अस्त्यत्रान्या) पौरुषेयी प्रवृत्तिः । यथा जातेरस्तित्वमतेन यावता वेति (?) । न तत्र शक्यते पुरुषेण प्रयासः स्रष्टुमिति । एष विशेषः । यदा तु द्रव्ये निमित्तापेक्षया प्रवर्तते, तदापि(? °सौ) जातिशब्दः । यदा त्वभिधेयं द्रव्यमस्य, द्रव्यशब्दः । एवं गुणशब्दोऽपि । शुक्लादिर्गुणशब्दः [गुण]-सामान्ये यदृच्छाशब्दः, [द्रव्ये] गुणनिमित्तापेक्षया जातिशब्दः, गुणाभिधायित्वात् गुणशब्दः । एवं क्रियाशब्दः क्रियासामान्ये यदृच्छाशब्दः, क्रियायां जातिशब्दः, क्रियाशब्दो वा । यावति च शब्दे क्रियानुषङ्गोऽस्ति, सर्वस्य क्रियाशब्दत्वं कृ[दं]तेषु तिङन्तेषु [च] ।

अन्ये मन्यन्ते । जातिप्रत्यासादेव तेऽर्था[स्] ताच्छब्द्यं प्रतिलभन्ते इति ।

अपरे मन्यन्ते – यदृच्छाशब्दा एवामी, जात्यादयस्तु केवलं भेदिका इति ।

अतस्तिसृषु शब्द[प्र]वृत्तिषु नियतशब्दत्वं नियतार्थत्वं च । चतुर्थ्यां तु शब्दप्रवृत्तौ अस्ति पौरुषेयत्वमिति ।

[१.३] **अशक्तिजानुकरणार्थ** इति । अथामुकः कः कल्पते ? यदृच्छाशब्दस्तावन्न भवति, नियतप्रयोगत्वात् । तस्माज्जातिशब्दोऽयमनुक्रियमाणे या जातिस्तया संबन्ध ऌतकमाह । यथा घट इति घटत्वविशिष्टमर्थं ब्रुवन् जातिशब्द इत्युच्यते । स च ऌत[क]शब्दो नान्येनानुकरणेन शक्यते प्रत्याययितुमित्यनिवर्तितं शब्दान्तरेण ऌकारवदनुकरणमिति ।

[१.४] **प्लुत्याद्यर्थः** । प्लुतिस्वरितद्विर्वचनेषु ऌत्वस्य सिद्धत्वात् क्लृपिस्थ ऌकार उपदेशं प्रयोजयति ।

[२.१] न्याय्यभावात् कल्पनं संज्ञादिषु (वा. २)। न्याय्योऽस्ति ऋतकशब्दः। कथं पुनरस्य न्याय्यत्वम् ? शिष्टप्रयोगात्। यथैव जात्यादिषु शब्दे[ष्व]विच्छिन्नपारंपर्योपदेशेन एतावन्त एवामी शब्दाः इति, एवमिदमपि अविच्छिन्नम्। यदृच्छाशब्दा अप्येवंरूपा एवेति। तत्र यथैव जात्यादिषु न स्वयमुत्पाद्यन्ते शब्दाः, एवं यदृच्छाशब्देष्वपि। न हि शक्यं काकवासितं हंसवासितं वास्य नामधेयं करोमीति तथाविधं नाम कर्तुं, शिष्टेना[ना]चरितत्वात्। संज्ञादिष्विति। आदिशब्दः प्रकारे। के पुनः संज्ञाप्रकाराः ? या अप्येता गोष्ठीविषया म्लेच्छा उत्पाद्यन्ते, एता अपि न स्वयं [श]ब्दानुत्पाद्य कर्तव्या इति। अथ वा संज्ञादिष्विति या एता जातिगुणक्रियानिमित्ताः संज्ञाः सर्वासामेवासां यदृच्छाशब्दा एवादिभूताः। न ह्यनपेक्षितनिमित्तान्तरा अर्थेषु विनिवेशं कुर्वन्ति। अतः संज्ञानामादिभूतेषु यदृच्छाशब्देषु न्याय्यो यः स कल्पयितव्यः। अपर आहेति। अनेनैतत् प्रतिपादयति। अस्मिन्नर्थे सनिबन्धनापि स्मृतिरस्ति। तत्र शास्त्रसमयादपि प्रतिपद्यामहे – एवंभूता शिष्टानां प्रवृत्तिरिति। ए[त]दुक्तं भवति। यत्र प्रसिद्धिरस्ति तस्योपादानम्, न त्वस्तित्वमात्रादेव प्रतिपत्तिः युक्ता। न सन्त्येव शब्दा ऌतकादयः इत्यतस्ते [न] प्रयोक्तव्याः। शिष्टाश्च प्रसिद्धिं शास्त्रं चापेक्षन्ते। भवांस्तूभयं निरस्यास्तित्वमात्रनिबन्धन एवेति। आतश्चैवं, यदव्यक्तानुकरणं व्यक्तेनानुकुर्वन्ति शिष्टाः, पटपटायतीति; न तथाभूतेन शब्देनेति। अयं तर्हि यदृच्छाशब्दोऽपरिहार्य इति। यदुच्यते – ' शास्त्रान्वितोऽस्ति ऋतकशब्दः ' इति। अयं ह्यर्तेर्निष्ठायां क्वुनि चान्वाख्यातः। ऋतीयतेर्वा इति ऋतक इति। न चैवं ऋफिडः ऋफिड्डश्चान्वाख्यातः। तस्मादयमप्यस्ति, ऌफिडः ऌफिड्डश्चेति। अस्येदमुत्तरम् – एषोऽपि हि (ऋफिडः) ऋफिड्ड इति। अ[र्तिं]प्रवृत्तिश्चैव हि लोके लक्ष्यते। ऋतकादिष्वर्तिरेव धातुपाठ उपदिश्यते, न ऌकारः। शक्येते च फिडफिड्डौ प्रत्ययौ कल्पयितुम्, ' प्रत्ययतः प्रकृतेश्च तदूह्यम् ' (पा. ३. ३. १ श्लो.वा. २) इति। अथ वा अर्तिप्रवृत्तिरिति। अर्तेश्चैव विकृतापभ्रष्टा प्रवृत्तिर्लक्ष्यते। लोके चञ्चलो गन्धर्वं ऌफिड्ड इत्युच्यते। इत्येवं [ब]हु वर्णयन्ति। एवं चैतत्। अथ वा, अत्राप्ययं पर्यनुयोगः – न शिष्टा ऋतकमेव प्रयुञ्जते। किं तर्हि ? ऌतकमपि प्रयुञ्जते। ऌफिड्ड[सदृ]शं [अ]पभ्रंशनामधेयं कर्तव्यमित्येतद्दर्शनम्। दृष्टार्था ह्येषा स्मृतिः। हंसतद्भक्षणादिवत्। दृश्यते ह्यस्या अनुरोधः, एषा कृतास्मरणा भक्ष्यता इति। शिष्टास्तु म्लेच्छनामधेयवदपभ्रंशं नाभिमन्यन्त इति। एवं प्रत्याख्याय यदृच्छाशब्दार्थतामशक्तिजानुकरणार्थतामपि प्रत्याचष्टे –

[२.२] **अनुकरणं शिष्टा[शिष्टाप्र]तिषि[द्धे]षु** । यत् विहितम्, यद्वा न विहितं न प्रतिषिद्धम्, तदेवानुक्रियते शिष्टैः । यत् तु प्रतिषिद्धम्, न तदन्येन कृतमित्यनुक्रियते । अपशब्दस्तु दुष्टस्तस्यानुकरणं न कर्तव्यं यो ह् वानुक्रियते यो नु(?) यद्यप्यर्थो वैदिकस्तथापि शब्दानां लौकिकत्वात् लोक इत्युच्यते । इदं तु विश्वजितः सत्राण्यासत इति वेदे च [प]ठ्यते इति ।

विषम उपन्यासः । एतदुक्तं भवति । नानुकरणाद्धर्मोऽधर्मो वा । किं तर्हि ? त्यागादनुष्ठानाद्वा । शक्यं चैतत् वक्तुम् अनुकरणमेवैतत् न भवतीति । यत्र ह्यनुकृतमात्रं (? °त्रे) काचि[त्] क्रिया सदृशा दृश्यते, [न] तदनुकरणं भवतीत्येतद् दर्शयति – **यस्तु खल्विदमसौ** इति । **स्नातानुलिप्त** इति । इदं स्वास्थ्योपलक्षणम् । अस्वस्थेन हि चित्ते[ना]कार्यमारभ्यते । **माल्यगुणकण्ठ** इति । प्राकाश्योपलक्षणम् । सुरां हि पिबन् ब्राह्मणः प्रच्छन्नं पिबेद्, अयं तु माल्यगुणकण्ठ इति । यद्यपि मद्यपानाशङ्काभावः, एवमप्यत्र कद[ली]च्छेदः । परं च केनचित् सदृशामनुकरणत्वेन [न] चात्र दोषो भवति । कुर्वन्ति हि शिष्टा एवंभूतमनुकरणम् । यदि ब्राह्मण्या लृतकशब्दमर्थपदार्थकमुच्चारितमर्थपदार्थकत्वेनानुकुर्वन् प्रयुञ्जीत, स्यात् प्रत्यवायः । यतस्तु शब्दपदार्थकं प्रयुङ्क्ते, तस्मात् पयःपानवदिदमपि न दोषायेति ।

अपशब्द इत्यपि तस्यापशब्दः स्यात् । अस्य हि यावन्तोऽसाधवो गाव्यादयः सर्व ए[व] वाच्याः । अतोऽर्थभेदान्नास्त्यपशब्दत्वम् । यथा गोणीशब्दस्यावपने साधुत्वम्, सास्नादिमत्यसाधुत्वम् । स्यादेतत् – अपशब्द इत्ययम[न]न्वाख्यातत्वात् । साधुरित्ययमन्वाख्यातोऽर्थवत् प्रातिपदिकमिति (पा. १.२. ४५) ।

अयं खल्वपि भूयः... । कोऽस्य विशेषः ? उच्यते । एतदप्यत्र नास्त्येवासाधोरयमनुकरण इति । **यदि क्लृपिस्थ[स्ये]**ति । एतदुक्तं भवति । आदावेवात्र प्रतिविहितमिति । यः प्रयोगे विद्यते सोऽयं, न च प्रयोग इदमस्ति 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' (पा. ८. २. १) इत्याह – **भवेत्तदर्थेन नार्थः स्याद्, अयं त्वन्यः क्लृपिस्थपदार्थक** इति ।

प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवतीति । सत्यपि वचने क्वचिदियं परिभाषा न प्रवर्तते । यदा त्व[व]यवस्य रूपतामाश्रित्य, नार्थरूपताम् अनुकरोति तदाधातुरूपेणाश्रितत्वात् प्रकृतावेवासौ धर्मो नष्ट इति तत्कृतं कार्यं न भवति । यथा 'विपराभ्यां जेः' (पा. १. ३. १९) इति इयङादेशो [न] भवति । यदार्थरूपतामाश्रयते, तदा

धात्वनुकरण इति प्रकृतौ दृष्टमियङादेशं प्रतिपद्यते, 'परिव्यवेभ्यः क्रियः' (पा. १. ३. १८) इति। द्विः पचन्त्वित्याहेति। अयं च तिङ् न भवति, साधनाभिधायित्वाद्धि तिङः। एवम् 'अग्नी ज्वालितौ' इत्युक्तम्। तमनुकरोति '"अग्नी" इत्ययमाह' इति। तत्र द्वयोरर्थयोर्वा एका(? एकस्या)भिव्यञ्जकस्य वा द्विवचनं [एकवचनं वा], नान्यस्येति।

अत्र त्विदमस्ति वक्तव्यम् -- गम्ऌ सृप्ऌ मुच्ऌ इत्येतेष्ववस्थितोऽनुक्रियते, साधु ऌकारमधीते इति, तदा नास्त्येतत् प्रकृतिवदनुकरणम्। अथ मन्यसे, क्ऌपि- [स्थ]श्चायं धात्वादिष्वनुषक्त इति ऋतकेऽपि क्ऌपिस्थ एवेति तुल्यम्। तत्रैवं ब्रुवते तदुक्तं भवति। अट्प्रभृतिष्वेकरनुकारो वा संवक्तव्य इति। ष्ट्रदिति ऌति वाचनं। अनेनापीत्संज्ञा भविष्यति(?)।

यदि प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवति, अपशब्द एवासौ भवति ... 'ब्राह्मण्यृतक इत्याह' इति। अनुकरणस्य प्रकृतिरर्थपदार्थिकासावपशब्दः। प्रकृतेश्च धर्माननुकरणशब्दो लभत इति अपशब्दत्वमायातम्। अपशब्दश्च न प्रयोक्तव्य इति शिष्टव्यवहारः। ततः प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवतीति प्रामाणिका या प्रकृतिरुपदिश्यते, सा प्रकृतित्वेनाश्रीयते। यथा 'स्थानिवदादेशः....' (पा. १. १. ५६) इति शास्त्रे यः स्थानी स आश्रीयते। न च व्याकरणे अपशब्द इत्येवं कश्चित् ऌ प्रकृतौ उपदिश्यते, साधूनामन्वाख्यानात्। अथानुमानादपशब्द इत्येवमन्वाख्यायते, न च सामर्थ्यगृहीता प्रकृतिर्भवितुमर्हतीति। अथ वा 'प्रकृतिवद्' इति शास्त्रपूर्वकं कार्यमतिदिश्यते। न चापशब्दे किंचित् शास्त्रप्रवर्तकं (? °पूर्वकं) कार्यमस्ति। न हि शक्यं व्याकरणेनापशब्दत्वम् अन्वाख्यातुम्। यदपि च कार्ययोगि शब्दरूपम्, तस्मिन्नपि न शक्यमपशब्दत्वमतिदेष्टुम्। तस्मात् प्रकृत्यभावात्, तत्तद्विषयस्य च धर्मस्य शास्त्रेणानाश्रितत्वात्, अनुकरणे चातिदेष्टुमशक्यत्वाद् इदमुच्यते अपशब्दानुकरणोऽपि नापशब्द इति। एवमवस्थितोऽशक्तिजानुकरणार्थं ऌकारोपदेशः।

अपरे प्रत्या[ख्या]त एवेति वर्णयन्ति। 'अपशब्द एवासौ भवति' यस्मात् 'अपशब्दो ह्यस्य प्रकृतिः'। न चापशब्दः। प्रयोजनं भवितुमर्ह[ती]ति वाक्यशेषः। कुत एतदिति इतर आह। तस्मान्न ह्यपशब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते इति। न चानुपदिष्टा प्रकृतिरस्ति। यणाद्वनामिति(?) वाक्यशेषः।

[२.३] **एकदेशविकृतस्यानन्यत्वात् प्लुत्यादयः** (वा. ४)। नात्र ग्रहीतव्यमादेशग्रहणादिति। एवं हि विज्ञायमानेऽल्विधिरयमिति प्लुतिर्न स्यात्। तस्माल्लोकप्रवृत्तिरेवाश्रीयते। ननु च लोके जात्यनुषङ्गात् शुनि संप्रत्ययः। इहाप्यस्ति जात्यनुषङ्गः। यदा च ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः, आकृतिग्रहणाच्च ग्रहणकशास्त्रं प्रत्याख्यायते, तदा सत्यपि श्रुतिभेदे एकाकृतित्वमेव, यथा ह्रस्वदीर्घयोरिति। **राज्ञ[: क च। राज]कीयमित्यल्लोपोऽन** इति। एवं मन्यते। कस्यचिद्धर्मस्य भावानुषङ्गात् स्मृत्यनुषङ्ग इति स एवायमिति प्रवर्तते बुद्धिः। तत्र ककारे कृते ककारानुषङ्गात् स्मृत्यनुषङ्ग इति संप्रति वचनमारभते – **षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्ये**ति। यस्य विकार[विधान]काले षष्ठीनिर्देशस्तस्यानन्यत्वम्। अत्र च ककारविधानकाले राज्ञः षष्ठी, नान, इति राजशब्दः स्यात् न अन्शब्दः। **क्लृप्तशिख इत्यत्र प्लुतो न प्राप्नोति। न ह्यत्र ऋकारः षष्ठ्या निर्दिष्टः। कस्तर्हि? रेफः**। तेन प्लुते नास्त्यनन्यत्वम्। **ऋकारोऽप्यत्र षष्ठ्या निर्दिष्टः**। सौत्रो निर्देशः, 'सुपां सुलुक्' (पा. ७. १. ३९) इति। उरिति च संबन्धमात्रमाश्रीयते। स कदाचित् साक्षात् अवयवं रेफं विशिनष्टि क्लृप्तादिषु। संबद्धसंबन्धाच्च कल्पका(रा)दिषु। **नकारान्तग्रहणमि**ति। राजकीये नान्तत्वं नास्ति। न हि श्वा पुच्छे छिन्ने पुच्छवानिति व्यपदिश्यते। **इह तर्हि क्लृप्तशिखः, 'अनृतः' इति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति**। ऋकारो यथैकदेशविकृत इति। "अरवत" इति वक्ष्यामि। ननु च मतुपात्र [न] भवितव्यम्। उच्यते। विशिष्टार्थप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं मतुप् उपादीयते। अरवत (? अरस्य) इत्युच्यमाने वर्तकेत्यत्रापि प्रतिषेधः स्यात्। अस्यापि रेफोऽस्ति समीपे। तस्मात् अवयवत्वेन तद्वत्ता प्रदश्यते, यथा विषाणीति। अत्र त्विदमुच्यते – बहुव्रीहिरप्यनन्तरादिषु प्रतिषिद्धस्तस्मात् सर्वबीजी सर्वकेशीत्यत्र प्रक्षेप्तव्यः। **स एष सूत्रभेदेन**। एतदुक्तं भवति – **अन्यार्थो**(यमन्य उपदेष्टव्य) इति, **सैषा [महतो] वंशस्तम्बा**दिति। रूपस्य साम्यात् तया क्रियया साम्यमस्येति।

एओङ्॥ ३॥ ऐऔच्॥ ४॥

[१] उपदिश्यमानता तपरातपरविषया संध्यक्षराणां भाष्यवाक्येनोच्यते। तस्याश्च असत्त्वभूतत्वाद् इदमा संबद्धत्वानुपपत्तिः। नैष दोषः। यो हि शब्दोपादानः स तथाभूतेन शब्देनोच्यमानः संबन्द्धुमशक्यो, यथा पचत्यपत्यमिति(?)। यदा वस्तुरूपं बुद्धावुपस्थापयति, तदा सर्वोऽर्थो विद्यत आत्मरूपेणेति किमिति न संभन्त्स्यते पचतिस्तस्यापत्यमिति? स एव वाक्यार्थोऽसत्त्वभूतोऽयमर्थ इत्यसत्त्वशब्देनोच्यमानः

सत्त्वभूत उच्यते । तथा चेदमा प्रति[नि]र्दिश्यते । एवमिहापि वाक्यार्थोऽनपाश्रित-शब्दोपादानः आत्मरूपेऽवस्थित इदमा संबध्यते ।

[२] कश्चात्र विशेषः ? कार्यगतं विशेषं पृच्छति । किं क्रियमाणेषु तपरेषु लभ्यते, अक्रियमाणेषु चेति ।

[२.१] **संध्यक्षरेषु तपरोपदेशश्चेत् तपरोच्चारणम्** (वा. १) । केयं वाचोयुक्तिः 'तपरोपदेशश्चेत् तपरोच्चारणम्' इति ? यावता 'दिशिरुच्चारणक्रियः' [मभा. १. १३. ७] इत्युक्तम् । तत्रैतदुक्तं भवति – तपरोच्चारणं चेत् तपरोच्चारणमिति । उच्यते । एतत् प्रतिपादयति – (१) यथान्येषामुपदेशश्च तावदस्ति, अथ लक्षणेन निवृत्तिस्ते न श्रूयन्ते । यथा थादी चुञ्चुप्-चणपौ । एवं तकारस्योपदेशे सति निवर्तक-लक्षणं नास्ति इति इदमुच्यते – तपरोच्चारणं कर्तव्यम् । (२) अथ वा गुणैरपि परिप्रापणमुपदेशः । संध्यक्षराणि चेत् तपराणि, तपराणि न च ता[नि] प्राप्यन्ते ऽतपराण्युच्चारितानीति । (३) अथ वा, तपरोपदेश इति तपरफलं प्रति निर्देशः । तपरफलं चेदिष्टं मन्यसे, संध्यक्षरेषु तपरोच्चारणं कर्तव्यमिति ।

[२.१.१] संध्यक्षराणीति पूर्वाचार्यसंज्ञैषा । तेषा चान्वर्थ(त्वं) संधीयमानावयवत्वात्, संधीयमानौ पूर्वपरावयवौ एषामिति ।

[२.१.२] अत्र च ग्रन्थे विप्रतिपत्तिः । कश्चित् सर्वाण्येव तपराणि कर्तव्यानि इति प्रतिपन्नः । कश्चित् एकारैकारावेव तपराविति, ओकारौकारौ तु 'तादपि परस्तपरः' (मभा. १. २३. २०) इति तपरत्वं प्रतिपद्येते इति ।

यदीह सर्वाण्येव तपराणि स्युः, 'ओत् ङ्' 'औत् च्' इति इत्संज्ञैव न स्यात् । [न] ह्युपदेशेऽन्त्यस्तकार इति । किं पुनस्तकारस्येत्संज्ञया प्रयोजनम् ? यावता तपरस्येत्संज्ञा न स्यात् । इयं विकल्प 'तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणम्' (पा. ६. १, १८५ वा.)। इह मा भूत् 'दिव औत्' (पा. ७. १. ८४) इति । तस्मादस्ति तपरेष्वित्संज्ञा इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । अतो 'दिव औत्' इति यदुच्चार्यते, तस्येत्संज्ञा । तत्र तिता यः प्रत्याय्यते, स तत् कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते – संज्ञी कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते । अस्ति, तत्र तित्करण-स्यानन्यार्थत्वात् । इ[ह] तु तपरत्वमन्यार्थं तत्कालप्रतिपादन उपयुक्तम् । संज्ञिनि तद् व्यपदेशस्य निमित्तं कथमिव स्यात् ? अनेकार्थत्वादनुबन्धस्यादोषः। दृष्टो ह्येकोऽनुबन्धोऽनेकार्थः, यथा ठगादिषु ककारो वृद्ध्यर्थः स्वरार्थश्च । सर्वत्रैव चेत्संज्ञा वक्तव्या ।

इतरेषां हि तपरं संध्यक्षरं तत्कालान् प्रतिपादयत् स्वस्वरूपं प्रतिपादयति। स त्वतिदेव यः तितः कार्यं प्रतिपाद्यते। कुतः ? तत्प्रतिपाद्याना[म]नुच्चारणा[त्]। नास्त्येतदुच्चारणोपाय इति। एवमपि संध्यक्षराणां तकारस्ये[त्सं]ज्ञा वक्तव्या। इतरथा हि तपरं संध्यक्षरं तत्कालान् प्रतिपादय[ती]ति सतकारकं संज्ञारूपम्। प्रतिपादिते च स्वरूपे इत्संज्ञा नास्त्युपदेशाभावात्।

अथेह कस्मान्न भवति स्वरूपग्रहणमिति ? एके वर्णयन्ति – का पुनरत्र संज्ञा ? आदिरित्याह। तस्य तूपलक्षणमन्त्यः। यद्ये[व]म्, आदिरेव संज्ञार्थेनार्थवान्, अनुबन्धस्तु काकवासितवदिति विभक्त्यभावः, 'इकः' 'अचि' इति। तस्मात् समुदायः संज्ञा। यद्यपि समुदायस्तथाऽणा(?) अतपरा एव तथापि इत्संज्ञयान्त्यो निवर्त्यते। इह त्वनन्त्यत्वात् असत्यामित्संज्ञायां सतकारकं स्वरूपं प्राप्नोति। प्रत्याय्यस्तु तत्प्रमाणः अतपर एव। त[द्य]था शुक्लवाससा तुल्यपरिमाणमानयेति अन्योपलक्षण[व्या]पारे शुक्लवाससो नान्तर्भवनम्, स्वव्यापारे तु तद्गुणविज्ञानमस्ति। एवं तपरत्वमन्येषूपलक्षणम्, स्वव्यापारे तु तपर इति तकारोऽप्यन्तर्भवति। अथ वेत्संज्ञायां प्रतिविधीयते। समुदायाव[यव]भेदाददोषः। ङकारो हि ए ओ इत्यस्यानुबन्धः, तकारश्च ओकारस्य। एवं चकार ऐ औ इत्यस्य, तकार औकारस्यैव। यथा सुटष्टकारः समुदायस्य, [ङकारः] औङ् इति तदेकदेशस्येति।

[२.२] प्लुत्यादिष्वज्विधिः (वा. २)। अभ्यु[प]गम्य प्लुतं द्विर्वचनादयो दोषा उच्यन्ते, यथाभ्युपगम्य ह्रस्वयलोपौ धातुविधितुक्-प्रतिषेध उच्यते।

[२.३] संप्रति प्लुतमेव चोदयति [– प्लुतसंज्ञा चेति (वा. ३)]। त्रिमात्रो हि कालभेदादप्रत्यायितः। तमपारणाद्य(? तदग्रहणादच्त्व)मप्रतिपद्यमानोऽशक्यः प्लुत इति निर्देष्टुम्। तत्र यः प्लुतोऽस्ति कथंचिदासन्नः, स प्राप्नोति इकार उकारश्च। एवं सति गोत्रातादिषु सिद्धं च द्विर्वचनम्, अनिष्टस्तु त्रिमात्रः श्रूयेत।

[३] अतपर एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे (वा. ४)। तपरत्वे पुनः सत्यर्धस्य एकारस्य भिन्नकालत्वाद् असत्यच्त्वे ह्रस्वसंज्ञाया अभावः। ननु च यस्यापि तपराणि। एतदुक्तं भवति। योगारम्भं प्रति साम्यम्; एष तु विशेषः – 'एचः' इत्यु[क्तम्], संप्रति 'ऐच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे' इति वक्तव्यमिति। ऐचोस्तु विश्लिष्टावर्णत्वात् संश्लिष्टावर्णौ अर्धएकार – अर्धओकारौ न भवतः इति। प्रत्याख्यायते [ए]तद्, 'ऐचोश्चोत्तर-

भूयस्त्वात् ' (पा. १. १. ४८ वा. ४) इति। अर्धमात्रा अव[र्ण]स्य, अध्यर्धमात्रा इवर्णोवर्णयोरित्येष प्रतिविभागः । तत्र ब्राह्म[ण]ग्रामः सालवनमिति यथा भूयस्त्वाद् व्यपदेशः, एवमिहापि इति । इदमपि प्रत्याख्यायते -- ' सिद्धमेङः सस्थानत्वात् (पा. १. १. ४८ वा. ३) इति । कथमिदं तत्र प्रत्याख्यातम् ? न स्त एव अर्धएकार- अर्धओकारौ इति । एतौ चेन्न स्तः, तालव्यस्य तालव्यः सस्थानः, ओष्ठ्यस्य ओष्ठ्य इति । एवं शिक्षाकाराः प्रतिपन्नाः ओष्ठ्यतालव्याविति । अत्र च [अर्धएकार --] अर्धओकारादर्शनेन शिक्षाभेद इत्येतत् प्रति[प]द्य[ते] । कथं तालव्यत्वे सत्ये-कारस्य [ऐकारस्य च] श्रुतिभेदः, ओष्ठ्यत्वे च ओकारस्य औकारस्य च, तेषां हि स्थानप्रयत्ना[दि]काः सर्वे अभिन्ना इति ? दर्शनभेदाददोषः । एके मन्यन्ते । योऽसौ वर्णस्य निष्पादको वायुः, स एकारस्य निर्वृत्तौ स्वसमीपे यः कण्ठस्तमुपश्लेषयति केवलम् , स्थानं तात्वेव । एवमोष्ठावेव स्थानमोकारस्य, केवलं तु वायुः कण्ठमभिहन्तीति। इतरे तदपि स्थानमभिमन्यन्ते । श्रुतिभेदो श्रोत्रा(? जिह्वा)ग्रमध्यमूलभेदाद् भवति यथा चयशानाम् । ननु चैङः सस्थानतराविति । एवं विद्यते । विद्यमानत्व-मेतयोरनेन सस्थानत्वमुक्तमिति चेत् तावेव सस्थानतरौ । न तौ स्तः । लाघवात् प्रत्याहारे विद्यमानौ तावेव पठितौ स्याताम् । ननु गुणवृद्धिसंज्ञार्थं उपदेशः स्यात् । दीर्घग्रहणं संज्ञायां करिष्यते । तथा च सति ' सह्विवह्योरोदवर्णस्य ' (पा. ६. ३. ११२) इति तपरकरणं वर्णग्रहणं च कर्तव्यं भवति ।

ननु च भोश्छन्दोगानां सात्यमुग्रिराणायनीयाः । किमर्थं छन्दोगग्रहणम् ? सात्यमुग्र्यादीनामप्रकाशत्वात्। सुजाते अश्वसूनृते । अं[तः]पादमव्यपरस्यैव एकारमादेशं विदधाति । पार्षदकृतिरेषा तत्रभवताम् । प्रातिशाख्यं ते कुर्वन्ति । ननु चैकचरण-विषयम् उपलक्षणं क्रियते, यथा ' देवसुम्नयोर्यजुषि काठके ' (पा. ७. ४. ३८) इति । सत्यम् , एवमेतत् । पार्षदकृतिरिति एतदुक्तं भवति । पार्षदमुच्चारणमेषाम् , स्वस्थाने च पार्षदव्यवहार एष, ना[न्य]त्रेति । एवंप्रकाराश्च तेषां बहवो व्यवहाराः कितकिटाकाराः स्तोभादयः । एवर्थमिदमुक्तं छन्दोगानामिति ।

[३.१] आन्तर्य[त]स्त्रिमात्रचतुर्मात्राणाम् । अन्यस्याभावात् इदमप्यत्र नास्ति, ' प्लुतश्च विषये स्मृतः ' (पा. ६. १. ८७ श्लोवा. २) इति । इह तावत् पशुमिति, ' [अमि] एकः ' इतीयता सिद्धम् । एतदपि वा न कर्तव्यम् । सिद्धो हि दीर्घः ' प्रथमयोः पूर्वसवर्णः ' (पा. ६. १. १०२) इति । सत्यम् । एवमेतत् ।

किं त्वारभ्यमाणे 'अमि' इत्येतस्मिन्, 'वा छन्दसि (पा. ६. १. १०६) इत्येतत् कथमारम्भादनुवर्तेत्येवमर्थम् 'अम्येकः' इत्येतत् स्यात्। तस्मात् पूर्वग्रहणं पूर्वरूपार्थं क्रियते। [ननु च पूर्वकं पूर्वग्रहणमनुवर्तते? सत्यम्।] तथापि द्वित्व(? दीर्घत्व)-मप्यनुवर्तते। ननु (? तत्र) चैवमर्था पूर्वानुवृत्तिः, पूर्वो दीर्घो यथा स्यात्। परं तूभयान्तरतमो मा भूत्। इदमप्यत्रानुवर्तयितव्यं द्वितीयं पूर्वग्रहणं 'प्रथमयोः पूर्वसवर्णः' इति। अथ वाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति। ननु च नियमार्थमेतत् स्यात्, इह मा भूत् उत इति। इदं तर्हि ज्ञापकं 'सौ च' (पा. ६. ४. १३), संप्रसारणस्य (पा. ६. ३. १३९) इति। एतदपि ह्रस्वनिवृत्त्यर्थं स्यात्, 'इको ह्रस्वोऽङ्यो ....' (पा. ६. ३. ६१) इति। तस्यैवेदं लिङ्गम्, संप्रसारणपूर्वत्वे द्वौ पूर्वशब्दावनुवर्तेते इति। 'अतो गुणे परः' [इतीयता] सिद्धम्। तत्र एकार ओकारश्च दीर्घावेव, किं रूपग्रहणेन? तदकारार्थमेव विज्ञायते। इह तावत् खट्वर्श्य इति। अयमभिप्रायः। 'आद्गुणः' (पा.६. १. ८७) इति सर्वेषु स्थानमुपस्थितेषु एकार-ओकारौ खट्वेन्द्रः खट्वोढा इति अवस्थितौ। अकारश्च श्रूयते गुणसंज्ञः, इत्यतो विगृहीतः श्रूयेत। यथोक्तम्, 'झकारभकारावपि पदान्तौ न स्तः (मभा. १. ३६. ३) इति।

तपरे गुणवृद्धी। यद्यपि संज्ञिनो भिन्नास्तथापि संज्ञारूपेणोच्यमानास्तल्लिङ्गसंख्या उच्यन्ते, यथा 'तरप्-तमपौ घः' (पा. १. १. २२) इति। अथ वा, तपरसहिते शास्त्रे तपरे। यद्वा, तपर इति सप्तमीयम्। त[प]रे विषये संज्ञिनि तपरे गुणवृद्धिसंज्ञे इति।

कस्य पुनस्तपरत्वम् उच्यते? संज्ञिनाम्। कस्मात्? संज्ञायाः परार्थत्वात्। तत्रोपायं(? यः) संज्ञायास्तपरत्वमिति संज्ञायामप्यासक्तं लिङ्गं संज्ञिनामेव विज्ञायते। यद्येवम्, संज्ञिनां कालावधारणं नास्ति, अनु[च्चा]र्यमाणत्वात्। तत् किंकाल-[पर]मिदं तपरत्वमित्यज्ञाते सति तपरकरणसामर्थ्यात् सवर्णानां न स्यात्। इदं तु नास्ति, द्विमात्राणां, न पुनस्त्रिमात्राणामिति। अथ मन्यसे संज्ञैव तपरेति, एवमपि एकारस्तपर ऐकारश्च सवर्णं तत्कालं प्रतिपादयेत्, न तु ओकार-ओकारौ चेति ग्रहणमेव वा न स्यात्। अपि वा सर्वकालस्य प्रतिपत्तिः स्यात्। संज्ञायास्तावत् तपरत्वे न दोषः। यत्र हि एच ऐच समुदायो न भवति, तत्रान्त्यवर्णस्य विकलाङ्गा परिभाषा नोपतिष्ठते। तत्र 'तपरस्तत्कालस्य' (पा. १. १. ७०) इति इदमेतावति व्याप्रियते – यस्य ग्रहणमस्ति तस्य तत्कालस्येति। तच्च ग्रहणं तपरत्वात्। ततस्तर्हि 'आदिरन्त्येन

सहेता (पा. १. १. ७१), 'तन्मध्यस्य च' (पा १. १. ७१ वा. २) इति अणेकारोकारयोर्ग्रहणे यथा अणित्यडिति वा आदिभूतेनाकारेण प्रत्यायिता [अ]-श्रू[य]माणा अपि इकारादयो ग्राहकाः [एवमोकार-औकारावपि] । यदापि संज्ञिनस्तपराः, तदापि 'आदिरन्त्येन सहेता' इति यः संनिविष्टः स गृहीत उत्तरकालं तत्कालान् [गृ]ह्णाति । द्विमात्रयोश्च संनिहित इति युक्ता तत्कालप्रतिपत्तिश्च ।

तादपि [प]रस्तपर इति । अनयोरुपादानमेकशेषात्, प्रवृत्ति[नि]मित्त-स्यानुपादाने स्वरूपमात्राश्रयणात् । 'सह्विव[हो]रोदवर्णस्य' (पा. ६. ३. ११२) इति लिङ्गात् द्वौ योगौ तन्त्रेणोच्चारितौ विप्रतिपत्तेर्यथा विभक्तिविशेषनिर्देशात् 'इग् यणः संप्रसारणम् (पा. १. १. ४५) इति । एकस्यैव वा शब्दस्य द्व्यर्थाभिधान-यौगपद्यादिति । **किं दकारे प्रयोजनम्** इति । [**अथ किं तकारे ?**] ॠकारान्तानां सर्वेषामुदात्तत्वाद[न]नुनासिकत्वाच्च प्रवर्तकं नोपपद्यते तपरकरणम्, नापि निवर्तकम् अनण्त्वादिति दकारेण तुल्यस्तकार इति ।

[४] **य एते [वर्णेषु] वर्णैकदेशा वर्णसमानाकृतयः ।** संध्यक्षरेष्वकारे-कारोकाराः अवयवा वर्णान्तरैकाकृतयस्तथा आकारादिषु मात्रिका एवावयवाः । एवमृकारे रेफः, ऌकारे लकारः । किमेते अगादिचोदनास्वन्तर्भूताः ? तदवयवस्य ग्रहणाग्रहणयोर्हे-तुमाह – **इह [हि] समुदाया अप्युपदिश्यन्ते, अवयवा अपि । अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदाये अवयवस्तद्यथा, वृक्षः प्रचलन् सहावयवैः प्रचलतीति ।** पूर्वो हेतुर्ग्रहणे, अपरहेतुरग्रहणेऽप्यत्र निर्दिष्टो भाष्ये । हेतुस्तु ग्रहणे ग्रहणम्, अग्रहणेऽग्रहणम् । 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' (पा. ६. १. १०१) इत्येवमादिष्ववयवा गृह्यन्ते । कुतः ? इहा-ग्र(?°ह ग्र)हणात् । इह प्रत्याहारे । **समुदाया अप्युपदिश्यन्ते** एओङ् ऐऔच् इति । **अवयवा अपि** अइउण् इति । यत्र चावयवपर उपदेशस्तत्र विद्यमानोऽपि समुदायो नेष्यते उपदिष्ट इति । यथा अइउण् इ[ति] न समुदायः । अङ् वा, अड् वा । किं तर्हि ? अवयवा एव, यथा हयवरडिति । अकारस्यात्रोपदेशात .... उच्चारयितु-मशक्यो नायमकारस्योपदेश इति वलादिष्वनच्का एव हलोऽभिधीयन्ते । एवम् एङ् इति ऐजिति चोपदेशे 'आदिरन्त्येन सहेता' (पा. १. १. ७१) इति समुदाय एवोपदिश्यते, नाकारादयोऽवयवाः, तेषामन्यत्रोपदेशात् । इ[हा]नुपदिष्टा अपि तु 'एचोऽयवायावः' (पा. ६. १. ७८) इति समुदायावयवा[आ]देशं प्रतिपद्यन्ते ऽनुमानादवयवाः न हि ते शब्दवाच्याः । किं तर्हि ? समुदायाः । यथा वृक्षशब्दो न

फलादिवचनः। तत्रै[व]मुपस्थितम् – यत्र समुदायकार्यं च संनिपतति अवयवकार्यं च, तत्र केन भवितव्यम् ? अवयवकार्येण। कुतः ? तस्मिन्नवयवस्य चोदितत्वात्। समुदायकार्ये ह्यवयवस्तेनैव पारतन्त्र्यमापादितः समुदायानुरोधात् निवर्तते। अग्न आ याहीति। यथा ‘ घृतमस्मै दीयताम् ’ इति भाजनं हस्तप्राप्तमपि ददातौ नान्तर्भवति। तद्दत्तमपि न दत्तम्, प्रतिगृहीतमपि न प्रतिगृहीतम्। एवमन्तर्भूतोऽप्यवयवो नान्तर्भूत इति ‘ अग्न इन्द्र ’ इत्यानुमानिकं समुदायकार्यं न प्रतिपद्यते, प्रत्यक्षचोदितमेव प्रतिपद्यते अकः सवर्णे दीर्घत्वम्। सर्वत्र वर्णा अर्कांश्वादिषु समुदायेष्ववस्थिता अक्-चोदनायां गृह्यमाणाः कार्यभाज इति यथैव पदादिसमु[दा]यस्थाः कार्यं प्रतिपद्यन्ते, एवं वर्णसमुदायस्था अपि इत्यतः प्रत्याहारग्रहणात् कार्यदेशेषु ग्रहणमिति।

संप्रत्यग्रहणे हेतुरुच्यते – अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदायेऽवयव इति। यन्मन्यसे प्रत्याहारोपदेशे समुदाया एवोपदिष्टा इति, एतत् कथम् ? सत्यपि समुदायोपदेशे एतच्चिन्त्यम्। किं तावदवयवोऽनुपात्तः, न हि शक्यतेऽन्यथा समुदायरूपं निष्पादयितुमिति समुदायस्थगतैवास्य उपदेष्टुः प्रवृत्तिरिति ? अथाभ्यन्तरीकृत्यावयवानिति ? वयं ब्रूमः अभ्यन्तरीकृत्य [इ]ति। तत्र यथैवादेशमन्तर्भावात् प्रतिपद्यते, एवमेचूत्वमपि; कार्येषु तु मुख्य एव व्यपदेशः इति। यथा प्रष्ठयां क्रियासङ्गो गौणः शब्दलाभस्तु मुख्यः, एवमिदमपि कार्यमवयवानां यदुत संज्ञालाभ इति, एतामपि क्रियां प्रतिपद्यन्तेऽवयवाः। एतत प्रतिपादयति – समुदायसंज्ञाला[भात्] पारतन्त्र्यं प्रतिपद्यमानोऽवयवः प्रत्याख्याय प्रवर्तते। यथा स[मु]दायोऽप्यस्ति वर्णान्तरमेवेदं जात्यन्तरयुक्तम्। यथा नरसिंहजातिः सदृशः काश्चित् पुरुषजातेः समुदायान्तरमेव। तत्र हि सिंह[मांस]मानीयतां पुरुषमांसं वेति [न] तन्मांसानयनं भवति। तस्मात् समुदायेष्वसन्तोऽवयवाः कथमिव निर्दिश्येरन्, कथं वा प्रतिपद्येरन् इति।

अपरः प्रकारो गृह्यते। समुदायसमुदायिनोर्भेदमाश्रित्योच्यते – अन्येऽवयवाः, समुदायोऽन्यः। उभयं चोपदिश्यते। तत्र यः संध्यक्षरेष्ववयवोऽस्ति, स कथमिव कार्यं न प्रतिपत्स्यते [इ]ति। अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदायेऽवयवः इति। एकत्वं समुदायसमुदायिनोः। नान्यः समुदायोऽस्ति, तथैवावयवौ। तथा संनिविष्टौ चेद् व्यपदेशं लभेते, यथा एतदेव प्रचलनं यदवयवानामिति।

अथ वा, इह समुदा[या] अप्युपदिश्यन्ते, अवयवा अपी ” ति एकविषयत्वमुच्यते। एओङ् इति, ऐऔच् इति अस्मिन्नुपदेशे उभयमप्युपदिश्यते।

तात्पर्येणेति शेषः । यथा गर्गादिबिदादिपाठः समुदायसाधुत्वप्रतिपत्त्यर्थोऽवयवानां च कलादिनिवृत्त्यर्थः इष्टः । अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदायेऽवयवः इति । समुदायार्थ एवोपदेशो नावयवार्थः । यथा पूर्वपक्षे गर्गादिबिदादिपाठात् ।

[४.१] समानाक्षरविधिप्रतिषेधः (वा. ६) । अग्ने इन्द्र इति । समुदायावयवाश्रयौ विधी प्राप्नुतः । अयादेशस्यावकाशः ' अग्न आ याहि ' इति । दीर्घत्वस्य दधीन्द्र इति । इह अग्ने इन्द्र इति विप्रतिषेधा[त्] दीर्घत्वं प्राप्नोति । अथ वा, अयादेश आनुमानिकः संप्रतीयो दीर्घत्वं साक्षादिति साक्षाच्छिष्टो बलीयः इति । यणादेशे कथम् ? तत्राप्यवयवः साक्षाच्छिष्ट इति । सत्यम् , एवमेतत् । अनवकाशत्वात् स बाध्यते ' ये[न] नाप्राप्ते .... ' इति, ' मध्येऽपवादाः पूर्वान् .... ' इति वा ।

[४.१.१] यदयं दीर्घाच्छे तुकं शास्ति । दीर्घात् परो यश्छस्तस्मिंस्तुग् भवति । कस्य ? ' तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य ' (पा. १. १. ६६) इति । ननु चैकारौकारार्थः स्यात् । तत्र ह्युत्तरा भूयसी मात्रा । तत्रापि शक्यमर्धमात्रामपनीय पूर्वस्य कर्तुमिति । योगविभागो लिङ्गम् , तुक् न भवतीति ।

[४.१.२] तपरकरणसामर्थ्यान्न भविष्यति । अत्र हि प्रवृत्तिः कृतार्था वृक्षैरिति । निवृत्तिरकृता[र्था] । निवृत्तेश्च लिङ्गं तपरकरणमिति साक्षाच्छ्रुतिर्बाध्यते दीर्घान्न भवतीति अनुमानश्रुत्या ।

[४.१.३] यदयमातोऽनुपसर्ग इति । अत्राप्यनुबन्धस्यासङ्गोऽनवकाश इति आकारस्य निवृत्तिरुच्यते । अत्र चोद्यते । यदि कित्करणं न क्रियते, इह दोषः ' मीनातिमिनोतिदीङां ल्यपि च ' (पा. ६. १. ५०) । यद्ययम् ' आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः ' (पा. ३. २. ३) इति अकार उच्येत, एज्विषयोऽयमिति मीनात्यादीनामाकारे कृते, अकारे च प्रत्यये आदन्तानां युगागमकरस्याणोऽप्राप्तिदोषः स्यात् । नैष दोषः । दीङस्तावदकर्मकत्वात् कर्मोपपदत्वं नास्ति । सोपसर्गः सकर्मकः स्यात् । तत्राप्यनुपसर्ग इत्युच्यते । मीनातिमिनोत्योरपि ह्वावामश्च ' (पा. ३. २. २) इति च ' आत ' इत्येतत् सामान्यग्रहणम् । एवं च कृत्वोच्यते – उत्तरार्थमेतत् स्यात् इति । एवं तर्हि ' गापोष्टक् ' इति । तत्रापि पर्यनुयुज्यते – छन्दोगायेति लोपः स्यात् ' आतो धातोः ' (पा. ६. ४. १४०) इति । न च प्रतिपदोक्तमाश्रीयते, पपुष इति न स्यात् ।

संनिपातलक्षणे यकारे तु [आ]कार एव न स्यात् । उच्यते । आत्वेनालोप इति लोप एव । तदेवं सति सर्वथा लोपेन भवितव्यमिति ।

[४.२] एकवर्णवच्च (वा. ८)। संख्या निवर्तिका सर्वत्रेति वाक्-शब्दो द्व्यजिति व्यपदिश्यते। तत्रैकवर्णवदित्यतिदेशो वा। एतु प्राकृतं द्व्यच्त्वमिति। 'सावेकाचः' (पा. ६. १. १६८) इति क स्यात्? स्रुचा त्वचेति। अथ वा, **गोनौग्रहणम्** । सामान्यविषयमनुमानं सर्वविषयं कल्प्यते ।

[४.३] नाव्यपवृक्तस्यावयवे तद्विधिः (वा. ९) । अविद्यमानं व्यपवृक्तमस्मिन् समुपाये सोऽव्यपवृक्तः । तस्याव्यपवृक्तस्यावयवे तद्विधिः न क्रियते । अथ वा, अव्यपवृक्तस्य योऽवयव[स्त]स्याप्र[थ]ग्भूतस्यावयवे पृ[थ]ग्भूते यो विधिर्दृष्टः स विधिर्न क्रियते । **सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो भवन्तीति** । ऋक्षु प्रवृत्तः शब्दः साहचर्यात् काष्ठेषु वर्तते । न च स[प्त]दशारत्निमात्रं काष्ठं सप्तदशव्यपदेशं लभते । भेदादिष्ठाना हि सप्तदशसंख्या । सैकसंख्याविशिष्टे न प्रवर्तते । तत्र यथैवावयवा अपृथग्भूता अव्यपदेश्या एवं वर्णैकदेशा अपि, इति । **प्र[त्यृ]चं चैव हि तत् [कर्म] चोद्यते** । तत्रोनातिरिक्ते दाहे कर्मवैगुण्यम् । अथैतत् स्यात्, सर्वमेवाभ्याधाय ऋच उच्चारयत्विति – एवमप्यसं[भ]वश्चाग्नौ वेद्यां च । अर्धचतुर्थहस्ता हि वेदिः । **यथा तर्हि** । एवमर्थमुपन्यस्तम् – नात्र ऋक्संबन्धात् समिच्छब्दोऽल्पप्रमाणत्वाच्च स्यात् संभव इति । **अत्रापि प्रतिप्रणवम्** इति । पूर्ववदेव । **यथा तर्हि घृतं तैलम्** इति । एतदुक्तं भवति – न संभवमात्रात् प्रतिपत्तिर्युक्ता । सत्यपि घृततैलसंभवे, घृतरूपस्य गोशब्देना[न]भिधानात् । तैलरूपस्य [च] सर्षपशब्देना[नभिधानात् तयोर्] विक्रयो भवति । एवं हि संभवमात्रे गोविक्रयी मांसविक्रय्यपि स्यात् । एष तु न्यायो विरुध्यते, माषा न भोक्तव्या इति । अनेन हि माषा हि व्यतिमिश्रा अपि न [भु]ज्यन्ते । सुरापेयेति मिश्रा अपि न पीयते ।

यत्र तर्हि व्यपवर्गो दृश्यते । क्वचिदेकसंख्याविशिष्टेऽपि व्यपवर्गो दृश्यते [इ]ति । क ? अपवरकादिषु । उच्यते ह्ययं पञ्चखट्वोऽयं सप्तख[ट्व] इति । एवं संध्यक्षरेषु प्रयत्नस्य विरामोपादानाभ्यां लक्ष्यः पृथग्भाव इति ।

संध्यक्षरेषु विवृतत्वात् (वा. १०) । विवृततरम् इति । विवृततममिति ग्रहीतव्यमिति । तत्र प्रयत्नभेदात् सावर्ण्यमेव नास्ति इति कुतो ग्रहणमिति ।

[५] अथ वा पुनर्न गृह्यन्ते । इदमुक्तमग्रहणं 'नाव्यपवृक्तस्ये'ति, एतदाकारादीनाम् । यत्र च व्यपवर्गः संध्यक्षरेषु, तत्राप्यसावर्ण्यम् । अत ऋकारऌकारावेवावस्थितौ । तत्र वाक्यकारस्येदं दर्शनम् – नैवावयवौ स्तः । समुदाय एव स जात्यन्तरयुक्तो नरसिंहवदिति । अनेन दर्शनेनेदं प्रक्रमते –

[५.१] नुड्विधिलादेशविनामेषु (वा. ११) इति । अथावयवाः सन्ति तस्मिन् समुदाये, तत्र समुदायव्यापारेऽवयवस्य कार्ययोगित्वं न स्याद् अयादिषु । यत्र त्ववयव एव व्याप्रियते, न समुदायस्, तत्र विद्यमानोऽवयवः कार्ययोगी न (?) स्यात् । नुडादिषु समुदायस्याचोदितत्वात् अवयवाश्रया नुडादयः प्रवर्तिष्यन्ते । नार्थ ऋकारग्रहणेन । यद्येवं तुक्यपि ह्रस्वस्याश्रि[त]त्वात् तुका भवितव्यम्, आऌय प्रऌयेति । तत्र च प्रतिविहितम् -- अव्यपवर्गाज्, ज्ञापकाद्वा 'दीर्घाच्छे तुकं शास्ति' इति, योगविभागाद्वा । अश्नोतेरेवावर्णोपध[स्य] । एवमनुमानं कल्पते, न त्वेवम् – अश्नोतेरेव कथं स्याद्, अश्नातेर्मा भूदिति ।

अविभक्तिको निर्देशः । अस्मिन् निर्देशे सति उरिति निर्देशः । तस्यानवकाशत्वाद् अवयवरेफस्य लत्वं भविष्यति । स्फोटमात्रं प्रतिनिर्दिश्यते । अध्वनिकः स्फोट इत्युक्तं भवति । ननु च ध्वनिम् अन्तरेण स्फोटस्योपलब्धिरेव नास्ति । एवं तर्हि य एवासौ आद्यो ध्वनिरारूपमात्रस्य प्रतिपादकस्तावानेवाश्रीयते । यस्त्वसौ विशेषस्य प्रतिपादकः -- अयं समुदायस्थोऽयं स्वतन्त्र इति – नासावाश्रीयते । विद्यमानेऽपि तत्र विशेषे आरूपमात्रम्, यथा गोर्विशेषेणोपलब्धिरारूपमात्रेण वोपलब्धिः । तस्मादारूपमात्रग्रहणमुभयोः । अथ वा, कार्यवत् बुद्धिं कृत्वा इदमुच्यते । तत्र कार्यपक्षे स्फोट एव संयोगात्, विभागात्, संयोगवियोगाभ्यां वा निष्पद्यते । यत्त्वनुरणनं तच्छब्दत एव । तेन य एवासौ स्फोटस्य निष्पादकः कर[ण]स्य व्यापारस्तावत एवाश्रयणम् । अथ वा, स्फोटमात्रमिति आकृतिनिर्देशोऽयमित्युक्तं भवति । तत्राकृतिनिर्देशे नान्तरेण ध्वनिमाकृतिं प्रतिपद्यते इति नान्तरीयकं द्रव्यं प्रतिपत्तव्यमिति द्रव्यनिर्देशे श्रुतस्य कार्यायोगित्वमिति आकृत्याश्रयणस्येदं प्रयोजनमन्तर्भूतानन्तर्भूतयो रेफयोः प्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् ।

यत् तद् रेफात् प[रं] भक्तेः । रेफेण वा[स्याः] सामानाधिकरण्यम्, भक्तिः रेफस्, तस्या यत् परमिति । अथ वा, अकारभक्तिरिकारभक्तिर्वा, तस्या यत् परमिति । अड्व्यवाय इत्येवं भविष्यति । एवं मन्यते – यथाऽकारोऽणुत्वात् दीर्घप्लुतौ गृह्णाति, एवं भक्तिमपि ग्रहीष्यति इति । आकृतिग्रहणे वा सर्वत्राकृतेर्भावात्

अस्त्यत्र इदं दर्शनमिति। अनेन दर्शनेन ग्रहीतुं शक्यास्त एव ये संनिविष्टा इति। एतदुक्तं भवति। येषामन्यत्राट्त्वमस्तीति। [ये] व्यपवृक्ता अपि वर्णा भवन्तीति। एतदुक्तमित्यनेन योजनीयम्। इदं तु वर्णतुरीयमन्यत्रादृष्टं क्वचित्, सावर्ण्यमपि नास्ति। न ह्यत्र समुदायप्रयत्नादन्योऽवयवप्रयत्नो, नापि स्थानम्। न चेयान् वर्णभागः शक्नोति जातिमुपव्यञ्जयितुमिति। **एतैरेवाक्षरसमाम्नायिकैरिति।** प्रत्याय्या अपि आक्षरसमाम्नायिका आकारादयः प्रतिपत्तव्याः। भक्तिस्तु न प्रत्यायिका न प्रत्याय्या। तदर्थो योगविभागः।

[५.२] **प्लुतावैच उदितौ** (वा. १२)। अस्ति ह्यत्र व्यपवर्गः। सत्यपि व्यपवर्गे यदाऽग्रहणम्, तदा इदं वक्तव्यम् ' ऐच उदितौ प्लुतौ ' इति। सति तु ग्रहणे ऐकारो गुरुस्तस्य योऽन्त्योऽच् तदादि टिसंज्ञमिति ' गुरोरनृत ....' (पा. ८. २. ८६) इत्येव सिद्धम्। आकारादीनां चात्राभावोऽव्यपवर्गात्। **क्रियत [एतन्] न्यास एव** इति। एतत् प्रदर्शयति – यद्यपि गृह्यन्ते, तथापि इदं न सिध्यति। एवं ह्युक्तम् ' संध्यक्षरेषु विवृतत्वात् ' इति। तत्र सत्यपि समभागे, भिन्नप्रयत्नत्वादसति ग्रहणे अच्त्वमेव नास्ति, कुतः प्लुतः? अथाप्युत्तरभूयस्त्वम्, एव[म]ध्यध्यर्धमात्रिकस्य नास्त्यच्त्वम्। न चार्धमात्रायास्तस्या अस्ति व्यपवर्गः। तस्मात् यथान्यासाश्रयणमेव युक्तमिति।

[५.३] **तुल्यरूपे संयोगे द्विव्यञ्जनविधिः** (वा. १३)। तुल्यरूपावयवत्वात् तुल्यरूपः संयोगः। न ह्येकत्वात् संयोगस्य तुल्यरूपत्वमस्ति। अभिप्रायः – यथैवाकारादि[ष्व]व्यपवर्ग इति नास्ति अवयवगतो व्यवहार एवमिहापि तुल्यः अव्यपवर्ग इति। आकृतिनिर्देशेनाल्पत्वमहत्त्वकृतस्य विशेषस्यानुपादानात् समुदायो हलिति द्विव्यञ्जनाश्रया संयोगसंज्ञा न स्यात्। एवं सति गुरुसंज्ञायामसत्यां ' गुरोरनृत – ' (पा. ८.२.८६) इति प्लुताभावः। **मात्राकालोऽत्र गम्यते, न च मात्रिकं व्यञ्जनमस्ति।** इहाकारादयस्तावत् पाठादवगम्यन्ते। आकारादयोऽपि सन्तीति सामान्यतो दृष्टानुमानाद् – ' अस्ति ह्यगाकृतिदीर्घा, यथा संध्यक्षराणि '। एतानि हि द्विमात्राण्येव पठितानि। प्लुतोऽधिको निर्दिष्टः, ' ऊकालोऽज्झ्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः ' (पा. १. २. २७) इति। तस्य ग्रहणमस्ति ' अणुदित् सवर्णस्य ... ' (पा. १. १. ६९) इति। तत्रोपदेशात् विधानाच्च मन्यामहे, शिष्टैरभ्युपगता एत उपदिष्टा इति। व्यञ्जनानां तु नोपदेशो, न ग्रहणम्, न क्वचित् विधानमस्ति। अतः शिष्टैरनुपदिष्टाः कथं शक्या

निर्देष्टुमिति । एतस्य चेदं बीजम् — यथाकारादिषु एकप्रयत्नप्रेरितकरणध्वनिर्ध्वन्यन्तरमारभमाणोऽनुपरत एव करणव्यापारे कालभेदं दर्शयति, नैवं व्यञ्जनेषु । व्यञ्जनमुच्चार्य पुनर्यत्नान्तरेण क[र]णं व्याप्रियते व्यञ्जनान्तर इत्यत्राविप्रतिपत्तिः शिष्टानाम् । अयं विशेषो यदिहासकृदुच्चारयति । तत्र यथैवासकृद् अकारमुच्चारयन् पुनः पुनः करणं व्यापारयति, एवं व्यञ्जनेष्विति ।

इह तु कथम् — सयँ्यन्ता स[वँ्व]त्सरः तलँ्लोकं यलँ्लोकमिति । पूर्वत्र ग्रहणं नास्तीति अभावं प्रतिपन्नः । अन्तस्थास्तूपदिष्टा अण्सु । ता ग्रहीष्यन्ते समुदायं तत्राकारवदिमाः प्रतिपादिताः शास्त्रेणेति । अत्रापि मात्राकालो गम्यते । इदमप्यत्रास्ति – एकोऽत्रानुनासिकः, अपरो निरनुनासिकश्च । अत्र सानुनासिको निरनुनासिकश्च भविष्यतीति दुरुपपादमेतत् । तस्मादुपसंहृत्य करणं यत्नान्तरेण पुनर्द्वितीयस्योच्चारणमिति नास्ति मात्राकालं व्यञ्जनम् । असच्चेत् कथं गृह्येत ? विद्यमानो हि शक्यः सवर्णेन ग्रहीतुम् । न हि मात्राकालोऽकारः शक्तः [अर्ध]मात्रमकारं ग्रहीतुम् । कुतः ? अभावादिति ।

हयवरट् ॥ ५ ॥

[I]

[१] अयं हकारो द्विरुपदिश्यते, पूर्वश्चैव परश्च । पूर्वपरत्वं न वर्णान्तरापेक्षम् । वर्णान्तरापेक्षायां ह्यकारं मुक्त्वा सर्वे एव पूर्वे परे च ।

[१.१] अड्ग्रहणेषु [ह]ग्रहणम् इति (वा. १) । किंचिदत्राड्ग्रहणं निष्प्रयोजनमुच्चार्यते, 'शश्छोऽटि' (पा. ८. ४. ६३) इति । अड्ग्रहणं चापि प्रयोजनवदुपन्यस्तं वाक्यकारेण । अत्र हि 'महाँ हि सः' इति हकारस्यानट्त्वात् 'आतोऽटि ....' (पा. ८. ३. ३) इति रुत्वं न स्यात् ।

[१.२] अशग्रहणमपि तु प्रयोजयति 'भोभगो ....' (पा. ८. ३. १७) इति । अत्र हि 'भो हसति' इत्यत्र अनशत्वाद् 'अशि' इति यत्वं न स्यात् । अर्थप्रदर्शनमात्रमिदम् । [ते]न वक्तव्यम् – उत्वे हकारग्रहणम् इति ।

[१.३] यदि [च] किंचिदन्यत्राप्युपदेश इति । एतत् प्रदर्श्यते — न ह्यत्र वर्णानां रूपप्रतिपत्त्यर्थः पाठः । किं तर्हि ? शास्त्रप्रवृत्त्यर्थः । तच्च शास्त्रं सत्यनुपदेशे हकारस्य न व्यवतिष्ठते इति ।

[II]

[१] अयं रेफः । उभयत्र प्रयोजनं दोषाश्च सन्तीति प्रश्नः ।

[१.१] 'स्वर्नयति' इति .... अनुनासिको णकारः प्राप्नोति । न ह्यस्मिन योगे सवर्णग्रहणमस्तीति । मद्रह्रद इति । अत्र द्विर्वचने रेफस्य कृते असिद्धे द्वित्वे [न] 'रो रि' (पा. ८. ३. १४) लोप इति द्वौ रेफौ श्रूयेयाताम्। कुण्डं रथेन इति। अत्र चानुनासिकेनैव परसवर्णेन भवितव्यम् इत्यस्य विशेषस्यानुपादानात् परसवर्णोऽ[न]नुनासिको रेफः प्राप्नोति । परसवर्णस्य असिद्धत्वात् 'रो रि' लोपो नास्ति ।

[२] पूर्वोपदेशे किस्त्वप्रतिषेधः (वा. ५)। पूर्वोपदेशे सति वकारोऽपि रल् इति । व्यलोपवचनं च (वा. ५)। वल्यनन्तर्भावात् रेफस्य । व्यलोपवचनं वकारार्थं प्रत्याख्यातं न यकारार्थमिति ।

[२.१] रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति । ननु चोक्तम्, एकत्र सावर्ण्यस्याचोदितत्वात्, अन्यत्रानुनासिकस्य [च], भवितव्यं रेफणकाराभ्यामिति । सत्यम्, एवमेतत् । अयं तु वक्ता द्विर्वचने परिहारं ब्रुवन् तयोरपि प्रतिविधत्ते । नेमौ रहौ कार्यिणौ [द्विर्वचनस्य] । किं तर्हि ? निमित्तमिमौ रहौ द्विर्वचनस्य इति । अस्मिन् हि वाक्ये 'अचो रहाभ्याम् ....' (पा. ८. ४. ४६) इत्यत्र रेफहकारौ निमित्तत्वेनाश्रितौ नोत्सहेते अस्मात् वाक्यात् कार्यित्वं प्रतिपत्तुम् । कुतः ? अस्मिन् वाक्ये 'यर' इति निर्देशे रेफहकारयोरनुमीयमानत्वात् । 'रहाभ्याम्' इति निमित्तत्वेन साक्षात् चोदितत्वात् । तद्यथा । ब्राह्मणा भोज्यन्तां माठरकौण्डिन्यौ परिवेविष्टामिति । अस्मिन् प्रकरणे वाक्ये भुजिक्रिया तयोरनुमीयमाना साक्षात् चोदितया परिवेषणक्रियया बाध्यते इत्येतस्मात् वाक्यात् न तौ भुजिं प्रति कर्तृत्वमनुभवत इति ।

यद्येवं दध्युदके दोषः । 'इको यणचि' (पा. ६. १. ७७) इत्यस्मिन् निर्देशे अजिति निमित्तभावं प्रति अनु[मीय]माना इकः कार्ययोगित्वं प्रति साक्षान्निर्दिष्टा इति बाधितव्यो निमित्तभावः कार्ययोगित्वेन । अथ मतमेतत्, एकस्य निमित्तभावात् कार्ययोगित्वं नास्ति, इह तु भिन्नावेव 'इकः' 'अचि' इति, इहापि मद्रह्रदे हकारो निमित्तमन्य एव, तस्मात् परो रेफो द्विर्वचनं किमेवं न प्रतिपद्यते ?

दर्शनभेदा[द]दोषः । आकृतिः पदार्थः, सकृल्लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम्, समुदाये लक्षणं प्रवर्तते, ज्ञानाङ्गं शास्त्रमित्येतस्मिन् दर्शने इदमुच्यते 'रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति,'

'नेमौ रहौ कार्यिणौ' इति। कथमिह 'यरोऽनुनासिकेऽनुनासिको वा' (पा. ८. ४. ४५) इति चेत्, शास्त्रमनपेक्षित[प्रयोगम्]। प्रयोगे रेफोष्मणां अनुनासिकादेशो नास्ति। शास्त्रत्वे(? °त्वं च) पुनर्न प्रवर्तते, यतः प्रतिपत्तिः स्यात्। यथोक्तम् – 'झकारभकारौ पदान्तौ न स्तः' (मभा. १. ३६. १–२) इति झुट्भुटौ न भविष्यत इति। एवम् 'अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्णः' (पा. ८. ४.५८) इति अनुस्वारसमुदायं परसवर्णसमुदायं [च] निश्चित्य शास्त्रं प्रवर्तते। तत्र 'स्थानेऽन्तरतमः' (पा. १. १. ५०) इति समुदायेनानुनासिकनिमित्तमान्तरतम्यम्। भवति हि समुदायः केषुचिदवयवेषु तद्वत्सु तद्वान्। यथा 'गोमदिदं नगरम्', 'दण्डिनो गच्छन्ति' इति। एवं परसवर्णेनान्तर[तमेन] भवितव्यमिति प्रतिपत्तिकाले। रेफस्तथाभूतो नास्तीति अपराध्यति। सकृल्लक्षणव्यापार इति नास्ति रेफोऽनुनासिकः। एवम् 'अचो रहाभ्याम्....' इत्येतदपि शास्त्रमनपेक्षितप्रयोगम्। किमस्ति प्रयोगे रेफहकारयोरेकस्मिन् सांनिध्यम्? नास्ति। एतावति प्रवर्तते, रहाभ्यामुत्तरस्य यरो द्वे भवत इति। तत्र यथैव यरो (? हकारो) निवर्तिता (? °तः), एवं रेफोऽपीति। एतावति ज्ञाते पुनःप्रवृत्त्यभावात् कया प्रवृत्त्या हकारात् परो रेफो द्विर्वचनं प्रतिपद्यते?

दध्युदकादिषु पुनः व्यक्तिः पदार्थः, प्रयोगाङ्गं शास्त्रम्, असकृल्लक्षणं प्रवर्तते, प्रतिलक्ष्यं यानि भिन्नानि लक्षणानि [तानि] आलस्यात्तु नोच्चारितानि इति अनेन दर्शनेन प्रतिपत्तिरिति। अतश्च 'न वेति विभाषा' (पा. १. १.४४) इति पक्षेऽभ्युपगमः पक्षे प्रत्याख्यानम्। युगपल्लक्ष्ये लक्षणं प्रवर्तत इत्ययमावेद्यान्यः?। मद्रह्रदादिसिद्धिस्तेनैव ज्ञापिता भवति। प्रतिलक्ष्यं व्यापारे शास्त्रस्य प्राकृती भवति सिद्धिर्दध्युदकादिषु। यद्वद्योगस्तस्मादशिष्योऽयम्?।

[III]

[१] इमे अयोगवाहाः न क्वचिदुपदिश्यन्ते। प्रत्याहारेऽन्यवन्न पठ्यन्ते। श्रूयन्ते च प्रयोगे, शास्त्रे च विधानकाले 'खरवसानयोर्विसर्जनीयः' (पा. ८. ३. १५), 'कुप्वोः ≍क-≍पौ' (पा. ८. ३. ३७) इति। तेषां कार्यार्थ उपदेशः कर्तव्यः। विधानादेतेषां साधुत्वं स्यात्, यत्तु कार्यं प्रत्याहारप्रतिबद्धं तन्न स्यात् इति। के पुनरयोगवाहाः? पूर्वाचार्यसंज्ञेयम्। महती चमूर्नूनमियमन्वर्था इति पृच्छति – कथं पुनरिति। [यद्] अयुक्ता वहन्ति, अनुपदिष्टाश्च श्रूयन्ते। इह केचित् वर्णा युक्ता वह[न्ति], लक्षणेन वाकृत्या [वा] कार्यं प्रतिपद्यन्ते, यथाकारादयः।

ए[ते] हि ‘ अणुदित् सवर्णस्य .... ’ (पा. १. १. ६९) इत्यनेन वा युक्ता वहन्ति, अकाराकृतिसमन्वयात् [वा] । केचित् पुनरुपदिष्टाः श्रूयन्ते, यथाकारादयः । एवमिमे न लक्षणेन युक्ता, नाप्याकृत्या, नाप्युपदिष्टा इति । अथायोगवाहशब्दे को व्यापारोऽनुपदिष्टत्वस्य ? एषोऽभिप्रायः – द्विविधो योगः, लक्षणयोग उप[देश]योगो वा । द्विविधोऽप्येषां नास्ति इति । अन्येषां ग्रन्थो – यदयुक्ता वहन्ति, अनुपदिष्टा [: च] श्रूयन्त इति । तेऽयुक्ता वहन्ति इत्यस्यैवार्थमनुपदिष्टाः श्रूयन्त इत्यनेन प्रदर्शयन्ति । उपदेशश्च शास्त्रे लक्षणेन पाठेन वा । स चैषां नास्तीति ।

[२] [शर्षु जश्भावषत्वे (वा. ७) ।] शर्त्वदशायां झल्त्वानुरोधेन जश्त्वमुच्यते । जश्त्वं चात्राप्युपदेशेन सिद्धम् । उपध्मानीयादेः । यदि पूर्वत्रासिद्धमद्विर्वचने, अथापि पूर्वं द्विर्वचनम्, उभयथापि अनिष्टं रूपम् । निपादना[देव] सिद्धम् इति । को वृत्तान्तो द्विर्वचने ? अत्रायमभिप्रायो – निपातनं हि लिङ्गम् । नैतत् प्रतिपत्स्यामहे, अनेनास्य भत्वं भवतीति । केन पुनः ? ‘ हृग्रहोर्भश्छन्दसि हस्य ’ (पा. ८. २. ३२ वा.) इति । वाक्यशेषोऽनुमास्यते उद्जेश्च दकारस्येति । न त्विदमेव निपातनं प्रापक[म]स्त्यस्येति । अकुत्वविषये [तत्] निपातनम् इति । विशिष्टविषयमनुमानं लभ्यते । गमेरेष द्व्यु[प]सर्गाद्व इति । संप्रति यद्यपि निपातनमेव प्रतिपादकम्, तथापि दका[रो]पदेशसामर्थ्यान्निपातनं प्रतीक्षिष्यते द्विर्वचनमिति ।

[३] अवश्यं नुमो ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । एतस्मिन् विषये नुमोऽनुस्वारेण भवितव्यम् । तत्रैवमर्थमेव नुमो ग्रहणम् – यत्रैवा[स्या]नुस्वारस्तत्र यथा स्यादिति । शर्व्यवाये तु सत्यनुस्वारमात्रे प्राप्नोति । – पुंस्विति । तस्मा[त्] नुमो ग्रहणमवस्थितम् ।

[४] अथ वाविशेषेणोपदेशः कर्तव्यः । नैतदनेनोच्यते, अड्भ्यः शर्भ्योऽन्यत्रापि कर्तव्य इति । किं तर्हि ? प्रयोजनगतो विशेष उदाह्रियते । णत्वं प्रयोजनम्, जश्भावषत्वे प्रयोजन[म्], इति एतन्न वक्तव्यम् । अट्सु चेदुपदिश्यन्ते शर्षु च, यान्यविशेषप्रयोजनानि तानि सर्वाणि सिद्धानि भवन्तीति । शर्षूपदेशादेव हल्त्वम्, ततः संयोगसंज्ञास्ति [श्वः] स्तोतेति । अट्सु चाल्त्वम् ।

[५] निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीति । यथा वैयाघ्रपद्य इति ।

[६] द्विर्वचनम् – उरःकेणेति (? उरःक इति) । श्रुतिभेदमध्यव[सा]योच्यते ।

[७] व्यूढोरस्केनेति । अटि विशेषे सामान्यमल्त्वमस्ति । विसर्जनीयश्च स्यादुपदेशादलिति । णत्वमल्वि[ष]यस्तत्र नास्ति स्थानिवद्भाव इति ।

[IV]

[१] किं पुनरिमे वर्णा अर्थवन्तः । सति निमित्ते प्रयोजने च प्रश्नः । तत्रेह किं निमित्तं वा प्रयोजनम् ? उच्यते । इह किंचित् प्रत्यक्षत उपलभ्यते । किंचिदनुपलभ्यमा[नमनुमा]नादस्तीति व्यवस्थाप्यते । किंचित् प्रत्यक्षाभिमतमनुमानान्नास्ति इति प्रतीयते । वृक्षादिषु च समुदायेषु वर्णानां प्रत्यक्षतो न कश्चित् अर्थ उपलभ्यते । तत्रानुमानादस्तित्वमवस्थाप्यते, यथानुपलभ्यमानाया आदित्यगतेर्देशान्तरप्राप्त्या । अलातचक्रवत् च प्रत्यक्षाभिम[त]स्यापि त्वे[व]मनुमानादेव क्रियते, ऽक्रियस्यापि तद्रूपस्य दर्शनात् । तद्यथा । रथचक्रमुपरतक्रियमपि चक्रबुद्धिनिमित्तम्, नैवमलातचक्रम् । तस्माद् भ्रान्तिरेषा, यदेषा व्यापिनो रूपस्योपलब्धिः किल । च[क्र]रू[प]स्य सहात्यन्तमवियोगात् स्पर्शस्य । स चक्रे हि यथैव रूपोपलब्धिप्रबन्धः, एवं स्पर्शोपलब्धिप्रबन्धोऽपि । नैवमलातचक्रे । विशिष्टदेशस्थैव हि स्पर्शोपलब्धिः । अर्थवत्ता च व्याकरणे सर्वत्रैवानुमानिकी । अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां धात्वादीनाम् । वर्णानामपि शक्यतेऽर्थं कल्पयितुम् संघातार्थवत्त्वादिति ।

प्रयोजनं चार्थवच्छब्दे प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा, तदाश्रया च स्वाद्युत्पत्तिरिति । अर्थवत्ता वर्णानां यदि त्वानुमानिकी, समुदायार्थादसंबद्धेनैवार्थेनार्थवत्ता सुराङ्गवत् । अथ वा समुदायसंबन्धिभिरेवार्थैर्यथा भवति तथा समुदायसंबन्धिनोऽर्था [अ]वयवानां प्रविभज्यन्ते – क्रियां धातुराह, साधनं प्रत्यय इति । एवं समुदायो द्रव्यं ब्रवीति, जात्यादींस्त्ववयवान् वर्णाः । अथ वा, यथा पदानि सापेक्षाणि तमेवार्थमाहुः, एवं तमेवार्थं वर्णा अपि परस्परापेक्षया ब्रूयुरिति ।

[२.१] एकवर्णानामर्थदर्शनात् (वा. ९) । अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां ह्यर्थो दृश्यते । किमत्र दर्शनं हेतुः ? यदि दर्शनम्, येष्वेव दृश्यते तेषामेवार्थवत्ता प्राप्नोति, नान्येषाम् । तस्मादेक[त्वं] वर्णत्वं च हेतुः । इह धात्वादीनामेकत्ववर्णत्वाभ्यां सहचरितार्थवत्ता दृष्टा । अमी च एकत्ववर्णत्वाभ्यामनुगताः । तस्मादेषामप्यर्थवत्तानुगमेन

भवितव्यमिति । स अयं तावत्वेत(? °द्वर्ण)धर्मोऽयं त्वस्याभिप्रायः । इह योऽर्थात्मा केनचित् धर्मेणायोग्यः सोऽत्यन्तमयोग्यः । तद्यथा । परमाणुरुपलब्धि प्रत्ययोग्यः सर्वत्रैवायोग्यः स्यात् । तस्मा[त्] [प्र]तिपाद्यमानेन धर्मेण यो[ग्यो] वर्ण इति । सा तु कदाचिदर्थवत्तोपलभ्यते केवलस्यैवासापेक्षस्य ।

[२.२] वर्णव्य[त्य]ये चार्थान्तरगमनात् (वा. १०) । यथा राजव्यत्यय इति एकस्य चापगमे अन्यस्य चोपग[मे] भवति, एवमिह कस्यचित वर्णस्यापगमे [अन्यस्य चोपगमे] वर्णव्यत्ययः परिगृहीतः । इहार्थवतामुपगमापगमाभ्यामर्थान्तरगमनं दृष्टम् । यथा प्रतिलोमोऽनुलोम इति लोमशब्दे व्यवस्थिते अनुप्रत्योरर्थवतोरुपगमापगमाभ्यामर्थान्तरगतिर्भवति प्रातिकूल्यस्यानुकूल्यस्य च, एवमिहापि ऊपशब्देऽवस्थिते ककारसकारयोर्व्यत्ययेऽर्थान्तरगतिर्भवति । तस्मादस्त्येतयोरर्थवत्ता ।

केषांचित् ग्रन्थः – **यः कूपे कूपार्थः स [क]कारस्य** इति । त एवं वर्णयन्ति – यद्यपि सापेक्षस्य, तथापि असौ भवतीति । अन्येषां ग्रन्थः – **सककारस्य** इति । त एवमाहुः – सह ककारेणार्थवत्ता इति । सह प्रतिशब्देनानुना च यथेति ।

[२.३] वर्णानुपलब्धौ चानर्थगतेः (वा. ११) । इहार्थवतोऽनुपलब्धौ सोऽर्थो न गम्यते । यथा पिबति विपिबति इति । विरत्र [पृथ]क्भावकर्मा, विपिबति सोऽयं पृथक्करोतीति । विशब्दानुपलब्धौ पिबतीति पृथग्भावो न गम्यते । एवं प्रतिष्ठते तिष्ठतीति । इह च ऋक्ष इति वकारानुपलब्धौ मूलादिसमुदायो न गम्यते । अत्रैतदुक्तं भवति – सर्वे वर्णाः सर्वाभिधानशक्तियुक्ताः । तेषां तु तस्यां तस्यामानुपूर्व्यां काचित् शक्तिस्तिरोभवति, काचिदाविर्भवति इति ।

‘ अनर्थगतेः ’ इति चासमर्थसमासः, अर्थस्यागते[रि]ति । अस्य पूर्वस्मादेष विशेषः – पूर्वत्रापायोपगमाविह त्वपायमात्रमेवेति । **किं तर्हि उच्यते ‘ ऽन[र्थ]गतेः ’** इति । एवं हि भवानाह **सोऽर्थो न गम्यत** इति । एवं च ब्रुवता इदमुक्तम् – अर्थान्तरं न (? तु) गम्यत इति । तत्र किमुच्यते अर्थस्यागतेः इति ? **न साधीय** इति । लौकिकी वाचोयुक्तिः । तद्यथा । कश्चित् कंचिदाह – किमनेन गतेन ? नायं करिष्यतीति । कश्चित् प्रत्याह – अयमेव गच्छतु, सुतरां कार्यं करिष्यतीति । तस्यार्थस्तदर्थः । तस्य शब्दस्यार्थः प्रक्रान्त[स्य, त]स्यागतेरिति । अथ मन्यसे, तस्येति किं समुदायो निर्दिश्यते अथ वर्ण इति, तस्यैव वस्तुनः साध्यत्वात् अयुक्तमिति तत आह

– सोऽर्थस्तदर्थः। योऽर्थः प्रक्रान्तः, सोऽर्थत्वेनाश्रितः। स एव वकारापाये न गम्यते इति। तद्यथा ... उष्ट्रमुख इति। अत्र नोष्ट्र एव मुखं संभवतीति इवशब्दो निवर्तते। स च समुदायशब्दो नान्यत्र अवयवे वृत्त इति मुखशब्दो निवर्तते। स च समुदायशब्दो नान्यत्र अवयवे, मुख एवेत्ये[व]मपि विशेषेणोच्यते। एवमिहापि प्रकृतार्थे तस्यानभिधानमाश्रीयत इति सामर्थ्यात् गम्यते इदम् – तत्रैव तच्छब्दार्थमुपादाय प्रवृत्त इति।

[२.४] संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्च (वा. १२)। दर्शनमदर्शनं च हेतुः। यथा तिलेऽस्ति काचित् तैलमात्रा, एवं वर्णेष्वपि अस्ति काचित् अर्थसंबोधनमात्रा। अनेकवर्णोच्चारणे तु परिपक्वा बुद्धिरर्थं प्रतिपद्यत इति।

[३] यदि तर्हि इमे वर्णा अर्थवन्तः, अर्थवत्कृतानि प्राप्नुवन्ति। एतदुक्तं भवति – प्रयोगेऽर्थवत्तायां सत्यां न दोषोऽस्ति। शास्त्रे तु किंचिद्विनश्यतीति। स्यादेषा बुद्धिः -- न संज्ञा दोषायेति। अत आह का[र्या]र्थत्वात् संज्ञायाः स्वाद्युत्पत्तिः स्यात्। श्रवणं तु न स्वा[देश्चो]दयति, विभक्तेर्लुका भवितव्यम्।

ननु चार्थवत्समुदायानां नियमार्थत्वे न वाक्यस्यार्थवत [प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा] इति। नैष दोषः। एककालैव प्राति[प]दिकसंज्ञा वर्णानां समुदायस्य चेति नास्ति सुबन्तसमुदायत्वम्। एकत्वमेषामर्थः। अथ वा, अविशे[षे]णोत्पद्यन्ते, उत्पन्नानां नियम इति अस्ति विभक्तियोगः। ननु च समुदायादुत्पद्यते विभक्तिर्नावयवेभ्यः, समुदायद्विर्वचनवत्। सत्यम्, एवमेतत्। अवयवाः पृथ[क् प]दत्वेनार्थिनः। तत्र यदि मन्यसे, समुदाये द्विरुक्ते अवयवा अपि द्विरुक्ता इति, एवं समुदायस्य पदत्वेऽवयवानामपि पदत्वम् इत्यस्त्येव पदकार्यं तर्हि।

[४.१] संघातस्यैकार्थ्यात् सुबभावो वर्णात् (वा. १३)। केचिद् वर्णयन्ति। संघातस्यैकत्वाद् यदेवमप्यर्थो वर्णानां, जात्यादयो नैकत्वप्रयुक्ताः। कार्यकाले (? °ल्त्वे) संज्ञापरिभाषयो[ः] प्रातिपदिकात् ‘ द्व्येकयोर्द्विवचनैकवचने ’ (पा. १. ४. २२) इति कथमेकत्वरहितानामव्ययानां विभक्तिरिति। अव्ययादाप्सुपो लुग्वचनं लिङ्गं सुबुत्पत्तेरिति।

[४.२] अपरे वर्णयन्ति। वर्णाः(? °र्णानां) सत्यपि अर्थवत्त्वे वस्तुमात्रसंनिपात एतावत् गम्यते – प्रक्रान्तं किंचिद् वक्तुं वस्त्विति। तस्य तु वस्तुनः संख्याधिगमः समुदायादेव। तस्मात् समुदायस्यैकत्वमर्थ इति।

[४.३] अन्ये वर्णयन्ति । एकमेतदेकत्वं वर्णानां समुदायस्य च । तत्र समुदायादुत्पद्यमाना विभक्तिर्यदि [समर्था] न स्यात् सर्वसाधारणमेक[त्व]मभिव्यङ्क्तुमुत्पद्यते विभक्तिः । यतस्तु समर्था .... । यथानेको द्रष्टा नैकेनैव प्रदीपेन कार्यं कुर्वन् प्रदीपान्तरमुपादत्ते ।

[४.४] इह्भवन्तस्त्वाहुः – **संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः** । सहैव वर्णैर्यथा नैकाचां समुदाय एकाच्, तेनैवावयवा अपि । येनैवैकत्ववता समुदायोऽर्थवान् तेनैवावयवा अपि । शक्नोति चावयवान् अनुमानात् स्प्रष्टुं समुदायादुत्पद्यमाना विभक्तिः । न च पदसंज्ञावयवानाम् । कुतः ? पदसंज्ञाविधानस्य शब्द[व]त्त्वात् । शब्दवद्विधानं पदसंज्ञाया यस्मात् सुप्तिङ्विधिः यथैवाङ्गसंज्ञा या शब्दव[ती]ति काकदन्तपरीक्षणमिदम् – 'किं वर्णा अर्थवन्तोऽनर्थका ' इति । यद्यर्थवन्तो यद्यनर्थका न कश्चिद्दोषः ।

[५.१] **अनर्थकास्तु प्रतिवर्णमर्थानुपलब्धेः** (वा. १४) । अनुमानादप्येषामर्थवत्ता नोपलभ्यते । न हि क्ष इति कश्चिदर्थोऽन्वयी लक्ष्यते, यथा [भवति] भवतो भवन्तीति सत्तान्वयिनी । तस्मा[त्] दशदाडिमश्लोकवत् प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामनर्थका वर्णा इति । **प्रतिवर्णम्** इति । वाक्ये श्रुतस्य प्रतेर्लक्षणादिषु कर्मप्रवचनीयत्वात् पृच्छति – **किमिदं प्रतिवर्णमिति** । इतरो द्विर्वचनेन वीप्सां दर्शयति – **वर्णं [वर्णं] प्रति** इति । वीप्सा च समासे निवर्तते उक्तत्वात्, सप्तपर्णोऽष्टापदमिति यथा ।

[५.२] **वर्णव्यत्ययापायोपजनविकारेषु चार्थदर्शनात्** (वा. १५) इति । नायमानर्थक्यप्रसाधको हेतुः । किं तर्हि ? परेणोक्तस्य व्यभिचारहेतुरयम् । व्यत्ययश्चेहावस्थितयोश्चैकस्मिन् समुदाये आदेरन्त्यत्वम्, अन्त्यस्य चादित्वमिति । कालव्यत्यासेन प्रयोगः । भवत्यादिधात्वादिभ्योऽन्येषां वर्णानामर्थवत्तायाम् इदमनुमानमुक्तं भवति । इह सति वर्णव्यत्ययेऽर्थव्यत्ययो न दृश्यते । यदि च वर्णाः प्रत्येकमन्योन्येनार्थवन्तः स्युः, यथैवाद्यन्तावन्तादी इत्याद्यन्तप्रयोगभिन्नः संप्रत्ययः, एवमिहापि स्यात् । अथ मन्यसे – एक एवार्थः सर्ववर्णेषु प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्तेरिति, एवमपि व्यत्ययस्य वैचित्र्यम् – क्वचिदर्थान्तरगतिः कूपादिषु, क्वचित् तस्यैवार्थस्य गतिस्तर्क्वादिषु, क्वचिदानर्थक्यमेव काकः कका इति । अपायो यथैव वकारस्यार्थान्तरगतिश्चैवमिहापि [अ]पायो घ्नन्तीति अकारस्य, [न] तदार्थान्तरगतिरस्ति । तस्मादनुमानं [न] भवत्यर्थवत्तायाः । **लविता लवितुमिति** । अर्थवतो हि पदस्य उपजनेऽर्थस्याप्युपजनो दृष्टः, दत्तो यज्ञदत्त इति । शब्दश्चानुमानिक्यार्थवत्तया प्रवर्तमानः शक्त्याधानं वा ...., यथौपगव इति ।

न चैवमागमस्तस्माद्वर्णस्य कुतोऽर्थवत्ता ? विकारः सूपादिभिः समानोऽत्रापि कश्चिद्वर्णोऽपैति, कश्चिदुपजायते, न चार्थान्तरगतिः ।

[६.] **उभयमिदं वर्णेषूक्तम्** । एतत् पृच्छति – किं धात्वादीना[मर्थवत्त्वा]दिदं प्रतिपत्तव्यम् – सर्वेऽर्थवन्तः, अनुपलब्धिस्तु कस्माच्चिन्निमित्तादिति ? आहोस्वित् कचिदानर्थक्यात् सर्वत्रानर्थक्यमिति, धात्वादिषु भ्रान्तिरियमलातचक्रवदिति ? **उभयमित्याह** । एतत् प्रतिपादयति – अर्थस्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धी भिन्नविषये द्रष्टव्ये । यस्य व्यावहारिकी अर्थवत्ता शक्यानुमानात्, तत्र कल्पयितव्या । दृष्टश्च समानेऽर्थे सर्वस्मिन् कस्यचित् तदर्थयोगः, कस्यचिन्नेति इदमाह – **समानमीहमानानाम्** इति । **संघातान्तराण्येवैतानि** । तत्त्वकथनमेतत् । यत्र ह्यानुमानिक्यर्थवत्ता तत्रान्वयिनः शब्दस्य संभवे भूयिष्ठोऽर्थान्तरो यो (? ऽर्थानुगमो) दृष्टः । कश्चिदेव तु विशेषः, प्रत्ययव्यभिचारेके (? °चारकृतः); पक्तिः पचनं पाक इति लिङ्गविशेषमात्रं प्रत्ययकृतम् । एवमिह ऊपशब्दानुगमे न कश्चिदर्थानुगमो दृश्यते । तस्मान्नैतत् प्रतिपत्तव्यम् -- ऊपशब्दे व्यवस्थिते वर्णव्यत्यय[ः] । **इदं खल्वपि भवता** इति । इदं प्रतिपाद्यते -- समुदायान्तरत्वे नाभ्युपगम्यमाने आनर्थक्यमेव सुतरामापद्यते, बहूनां शब्दानामानर्थक्याभ्युपगमात् । एष हि न्यायो यदूपशब्दो व्यवस्थितस्तमर्थं ब्रूयात् । न चेद् ब्रवीति, आनर्थक्यमभ्युपगतं भवतीति । **संघातार्थवत्त्वात्** इति । **अस्य परिहारं** वक्ष्यति -- 'दृष्टा ह्यत[द]र्थेनापि गुणेन गुणिनोऽर्थवत्ता सुराङ्गवद् रथाङ्गवत्' इति ।

[V]

प्रत्याहा[रे]नुबन्धानां कथमज्ग्रहणेषु न (श्लो. वा.) । एतेऽपि ह्यत्र संनिविष्टाः पठिताः, संनिहिताश्च । कार्यार्थश्चासकृद् उपदिष्टः हकारः । एवममी अपि कार्यार्थं बहुकृत्व उपदिश्येरन् इति ।

आचारात् (श्लो. वा.) । उपचारनिमित्ता प्रवृत्तिः । एवमाचार्याः प्रवृत्ताः यदेष्वच्कार्याणि न कृतवन्तः । 'तृषिमृषिकृषेः ...' (पा. १. २. २५) इति । तत्र यथैव निपातनं बाधकं सामान्यप्राप्तस्य णत्वस्य '... सर्वनामानि' (पा. १. १. २७) इति, एवं सत्यपि ग्रहणे बाधकं निपातनं यणादेशस्य हलृष्विति । इयमेका कल्पना । अथ वा, आचारादि[द]मवसीयते, अप्र[यो]जकानामेषामिहस्थानामुपदेश इति । अकारादय एवात्र प्र[यो]जकाः 'आदिरन्त्येन सहेता' (पा. १. १. ७१) इति, न एते ।

[२.२] अप्रधानत्वात् (श्लो. वा.) इति। अनेन शेषशेषिभाव आख्यायते। शेषः शेषिणं प्रति विशेषणत्वेनोपात्तो न शक्यस्तुल्यवत् प्रसंख्यातुं कार्ययोगित्वं प्रतीति विशेषणभावेनोपात्तानामनुबन्धानां नास्ति कार्ययोगित्वम्। तत्र यथैव प्रकृत्यादीनां प्रत्ययसंज्ञा न भवतीति हेतुद्वयमुक्तम् – एकेनाप्रयोजकत्वं ख्याप्यते ' निमित्तस्य निमित्तिकार्यार्थत्वात् ... ' (पा. ३. १. १ वा. २) इति, द्वितीयेन शेषशेषिभावापत्तिः ' प्रधाने कार्यसंप्रत्ययात् ... ' (पा. ३. १. १ वा ३) इति, एवमिहाप्यनुबन्धानामप्रयोजकत्वात् शेषत्वाच्च [अ]ग्रहणमिति। कुत एतत्। अयमभिप्रायः – यथैव गर्गादिबिदादिपाठः उभयकारी एवमयमपि पाठोऽनुबन्धानां स्वार्थः परार्थश्च स्यादिति। एतत् निवर्तयति आचार्याचारादेव। यथैव लोकः प्रवर्तते – तुल्यजातीयेषु ब्राह्मणेषु ब्राह्मणैरेव सह भोक्ष्यते, क्षत्रियेषु क्षत्रियैः, एवमिहापि एषैव शैली लक्ष्यते। शीले भवा शैली, समाधानपूर्विका प्रवृत्तिः।

[२.३] लोपश्च बलवत्तरः (श्लो. वा.)। यद्युपपत्तिर्न गृह्यते, इतः प्रतिपद्यस्याग्रहणम्। अजिति प्रत्याहारे अनुबन्ध एव गृह्यते ' आदिरन्त्येन ... (पा. १. १. ७१) ... असत इदिति संज्ञा कृता, असन् स्वयं कार्येषु व्याप्रियते इति ज्ञातम्। एवं ह्युक्तम् – ' भावो हि कार्यार्थोऽनन्यार्थो लोपः ' (पा. १. ३. ९ वा.) इति। तदसतः कथमिव ग्रहणं भविष्यति ? इति।

[२.४] ऊकालोऽजिति वा योगः (श्लो. वा.)। ' आदिरन्त्येन ' इति प्रसिद्धे सत्यच्त्वे योगविभागः क्रियते, कालेन परिच्छिन्नस्याच्त्वप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम्। यथा पूर्वपरप्रयोगे सति गत्युपसर्गसंज्ञे प्रसक्ते नियम्येते। संज्ञानियमनपक्षे ' ते प्राग् धातोः ' (पा. १. ४. ८०) इति प्राक् प्रयुज्यमाना[नां] गत्युपसर्गसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति। तत्रोकालत्वमर्धमात्रिकाणां नास्तीति भावः। एवमपि कुक्कुटः अत्रापि प्राप्नोति। कथं पुनरस्य [अ]पठितस्य प्रत्याहारेऽन्तर्भावः ? आकृतिग्रहणादित्यभिप्रायः। आकृतिरुपदिष्टा, कदाचिदर्धमात्राधीना कदाचिन् मात्रिकाधीना। कदाचिदेकेन हलाभिव्यज्यते, कदाचित् द्वाभ्याम्। अस्मिंश्च प्रत्याख्यातं ग्रहणकशास्त्रम् ' अणुदित् सवर्णस्य च ' (पा. १.१.६९) इति।

[२.४.१] अयमाह – ह्रस्वादीनां वचनात् प्राग् यावत् तावदेव योगोऽस्तु (श्लो. वा.)। ' ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः ' (पा. १. २. २७) इत्यस्मात् प्राग्

यावत् शब्दरूपं तावद् योगोऽस्तु । कियत् ? य[दे]तद् ‘ ऊकालोऽच् .... ’ (पा. १. २. २७) इति । एतदत्र वर्ण्यते – व्यक्तिनिर्देशोऽयम् । इदं चास्ति ‘ अणुदि[त्] ’ [इ]ति । प्रत्याहारे च ऊकालता आश्रीयते, ऊकालो यः सोऽजिति प्रत्याहारे संनिविष्ट इति । निदर्शनमात्रं चेदमजिति । सत्य[त्त्वे] प्रत्याहारेष्वेवाजिति वा अणिति वा संनिविष्टा एत इति प्रतिज्ञातव्यम् । तस्मा[त्] णादीनामसत्यजि(?° णि)-ति व्यपदेशो ग्राहकत्वं नास्तीति । सत्यप्रथं कुर्यादिष्टकार्यं भविष्यति(?) ।

[VI]

अथ किमर्थमन्तस्थानाम् इति । इदमत्र पृच्छ्यमानम्, किमर्थम् ‘ अणुदित् सवर्णस्य .... ’ (पा. १. १. ६९) इति णकारेण प्रत्याहारः क्रियते यत्रान्तस्था अप्यन्तर्भाव्यन्ते, न पुनश्चकारेण प्रत्याहारः क्रियत इति । इतरथा हि यद्यत्र न पठेयरन्, इण्ग्रहणान्यनन्तस्थाकानि स्युः । ततश्च षत्वं न स्यात्, गीर्षु, हल्षु इति ।

ननु च [भेदो] भवति । श्रुतिकृतं भेदमध्यवसाय ब्रवीति । तदेतदत्यन्तं संदिग्धं [वर्तते] आ[चा]र्याणाम् इति । ज्ञापकाद्ध्यनुमिमते विभाषानुवृत्तिम् । तेषामनैकान्तिकत्वात् अनुमा[न]स्य संदिग्धमेव भवतीति ।

लण् ॥ ६ ॥

[१.] अत्रायं णकारो द्विरनुबध्यते । अत्र प्रकरणे षट् प्रकारा उपक्षिप्ताः – आसत्तिः, व्याप्तिः, सामर्थ्यं, प्रसिद्धिः, लिङ्गं, लाघवमिति । [आस]त्तेर्न्यायात क्रमव्यतिक्रमे च प्रयोजनाभावात् पूर्वेण स्यात् । भूयसां ग्रहणमिति व्याप्तेर्न्यायात् परेण भवितव्यम् । तत्र लक्ष्यवशात् किमासत्तिराहोस्वित् व्याप्तिरिति संदिह्यते । तत्र द्वयोर-[ण्]ग्रहणयोः सामर्थ्येनासत्तिरवस्थिता, व्याप्तिर्बाधिता ।

अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्य इति । भाष्यकारेणैव पठितमष्टमे वृक्षव् करोतीति । तत्र न ज्ञायते, केनाभिप्रायेणाह – न पदान्ताः परेऽणः संभवन्ति ।

गृधेर्यङ्लुगन्तस्य लङि सिपि रूपम् अजर्घाः इति, एवं स्पर्धेरपि अपास्पा इति।

धातुग्रहणं करोति । शक्यतेऽत्र वक्तुम्, धातुग्रहणात् लिङ्गात् मात्रा केवल-मुपजायते, न स्थान्यादेशभाव इति । एवं तु चिकीर्षतीत्यादिदोषो विरुध्यते । इहापि तर्हि न प्राप्नोति, चिकीर्षति जिहीर्षतीति । अत्र चोद्यते – धातुग्रहणात् रपरत्वे

निवर्तिते ननु सिद्धमित्त्वं चिकीर्षतीति। अयमभिप्रायः – धातुग्रहणादधातोरेव रपरत्वं [निवर्तितम्], धातोस्तु रपरत्वं स्यादेव। ततश्चानन्त्यत्वादप्राप्तिरिति। अथ वा, धातुग्रहणमेवमर्थं स्यात् – सर्वत्र रपरत्वे कृते अनन्त्यत्वात् इत्त्वेऽप्राप्ते धातोर्यत्रतत्रस्थस्य ॠत इत्त्वं भवतीति। मा भूदेवम्। उपधाया एव भविष्यति। अन्तरेण धातुग्रहणम् इहापि [तर्हि] प्राप्नोति, मातॄणाम् इति, रपरत्वे कृते उपधाभावात्। तस्मादवश्यं कर्तव्यं धातुग्रहणम्। यश्चोपदिष्ट उरण्रपरसूत्रे ' उदात्तादिषु रपरत्वम् ' (पा. १. १. ५१ वा. ५) इति, स तु दोषोऽस्त्येव परेण ग्रहणे सति कृतिरित्येवमादिषु। एवं सामर्थ्यात् व्याप्तौ बाधितायाम् इदं प्रसिद्धम् – पूर्वेण ग्रहणमिति। अतः प्रसिद्धेः पृच्छति – अस्मिंस्तर्हि [अण्ग्रहणे] संदेहः किमत्र प्रसिद्धिरथ व्याप्तिरिति। प्रसिद्धिर्लिङ्गेन बाध्यते। सवर्णेऽण्ग्रहणम् इति। अतः ह्युरॄत्। अचीकृतत् – ॠकारस्य स्थाने मात्रिकः कथं स्यादिति तपरकरणं युक्तम्। ननु च भाव्यमानेन ग्रहणं नेति। सत्यम्, एवमेतत्। अस्ति तु ग्रहणप्रसङ्गो यो यत्नेन निवर्त्यते। तस्माल्लिङ्गेनेह प्रसिद्धिर्बाध्यते।

इण्ग्रहणेषु तर्हि संदेहः। .... [तच्च गुरु भवति।] अत्र लाघवात् व्याप्तिर्भवति इति न चासक्तिः। ननु चाच्कालं व्यञ्जनकालोऽनुविधत्ते। तत्र य एवाच्कालः स एव पूर्वभवानां व्यञ्जनानाम्। एकायधात(? एकीयमत)मेतत्। अन्येषां भिद्यते कालः। अथ वा, क्लेशेनोच्चारणं गौरवम्, सुखेनोच्चारणं लाघवमिति। भवत्येषा परिभाषा। यद्यपि श्रोता न प्रतिपद्येत तमर्थ (? तदर्थं) लाघवेना[था]पि न तस्य विशिष्टार्थाभिधानेऽशक्तिरुपलभ्यते। तस्मादाचार्यो व्यवहरत्यनेन, व्याख्यानात् विशेषः प्रतिपद्यत इति।

ञमङणनम्। झभञ्॥ ७, ८॥

[१] किमर्थमिमौ। स्थानद्वयव्यापाराद् गौरवं करणनाशश्चेत्यतः पृच्छति। एवमपि पञ्चागमाः। ङणनझभाः। त्रय आगमिनः। ङणनाः। तेन एकैकस्य पञ्च पञ्च स्युः। सन्तु तावद्येषामागमानामागमिनः इति। इह उद्देशानुदेशौ शास्त्रप्रतिबद्धौ। तत्र प्रयोगनिरपेक्षादेव शास्त्र[ाल्लब्धयथा]संख्यागमाः (? °ख्या आगमाः) प्रतिपन्नाः, यथास्वं प्रविभक्ताः प्रयोगकाले प्रवर्तन्ते। तत्र झभावागमिनौ न स्तः इति न प्रवर्तेते। चोदनायाश्च[ाभा]वात् पुनर्ङणनेषु न प्रवर्तेते।

[एतद्व्याख्यानेनैव व्याख्यातप्रायत्वात् त्यक्तानि नव सूत्राणि वेदितव्यानि।]

[२] अथ किमिदमक्षरमिति। केषांचिद्वर्णोऽक्षरम्, के[षां]चित् पदं वाक्यं च। इदं चोक्तम् – 'यो वा इमां स्वरशोऽक्षरशः' इति।

अक्षरं न क्षरं विद्यात् (श्लो.वा.)। क्रियाशब्दो यथा पाचक इति। न क्षरति, न क्षीयत इत्यतोऽक्षरम्। 'न क्षरति' इत्येतदप्रसिद्धम्। अस्मिन्नर्थे प्रसिद्धार्थं व्याचष्टे 'न क्षीयते' इति। यथा 'क्षणः क्षणोतेः। प्रक्ष्णुतः कालो भवति'। क्ष्णौतिः क्षयतिकर्मेति।

अश्नोतेर्वा सरोऽक्षरम् (श्लो.वा.)। अश्नुतेऽर्थं यस्मात्, अर्थं व्याप्नोति तेन वा, अर्थेन व्याप्तं यस्मात्, तस्मादक्षरम्। तच्च पदं वाक्यम्।

वर्णं वाहुः पूर्वसूत्रे (श्लो.वा.) संप्रति नामधेयमिदमिति कथ्यते। एवं ह्यन्येन पठ्यते, 'वर्णा अक्षराणि' इति।

किमर्थमुपदिश्यते (श्लो.वा.)। न हि वर्णानां साधुत्वं प्रतिपाद्य[म्]। कस्य तर्हि? समुदायस्य, तस्यार्थे प्रयुक्तत्वात्।

वर्णज्ञानं वाग्विषयः (श्लो.वा.)। वर्णा येन ज्ञायन्ते तत् वर्णज्ञानम्। किं पुनस्तत्? शास्त्रम्। तत् वाचो विषयः। शास्त्रे हि वाक् विषीयते अवबध्यते।

यत्र च ब्रह्म वर्तते (श्लो.वा.)। यस्मिंश्च ब्रह्म वेदो वर्तते। क्व च वर्तते? पदे। तस्य वर्णस्य शास्त्रं विषयः। एतत् कथयति – लौकिकानां च शब्दानामिति।

तदर्थम् (श्लो.वा.)। तदित्यनेन वर्णज्ञानमभिसंबध्यते। शास्त्रप्रवृत्त्यर्थं वर्णा उपदिश्यन्ते। यदेवोक्तं वाक्यकारेण 'वृत्तिसमवायार्थ उपदेशः' (पस्पशा वा. १५) इति, तदेव श्लोकवार्त्तिककारोऽप्याह।

इष्टबुद्ध्यर्थम् (श्लो.वा.)। निवृत्तकलादिकान् इति।

लघ्वर्थं चोपदिश्यते इति (श्लो.वा.)। अनेन चानुबन्धासङ्गं प्रदर्शयति 'अनुबन्धकरणार्थश्च' (पस्पशा वा. १६) इति।

सोऽयमक्षरसमाम्नायो वाक्समाम्नायः। एतावतीयं वाक् समाम्नाता, एतावान् वाग्व्यवहारः। पुष्पितः फलितश्च। दृष्टादृष्टफलाभ्यामभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसाभ्याम्।

चन्द्रतारकवत् प्रतिमण्डितः । एतदुक्तं भवति – यथैवेदमव्युच्छिन्नं चन्द्रतारकादि, एवमस्य वाग्व्यवहारस्य न कश्चित् कर्ता अस्ति; एवमेवेदं पारंपर्येण स्मर्यमाणं स्मर्यमाणम् । **ब्रह्मराशिः** इति । यथैत्र संहृतक्रमो ब्रह्मराशिरिति शः (?) प्रतिपुरुषं व्यवस्थितः, एवमयं प्रत्या[हा]रः शक्यं वक्तुम् । **विज्ञानब्रह्मवदुपसंभृतो ब्रह्मणा । सर्ववेदपुण्यफलावाप्तिश्चास्य ज्ञाने भवति ।** सर्ववेदाध्ययने कृते तस्य पुण्यस्य यत् फलं तदवाप्नोति । **मातापितरौ चास्य** इति । मृतयोरपि अध्ययनं न त्यक्तव्यम्, तयोरिष्टफलावाप्त्यर्थम् । जीवतोरपि वा; यदा मसुष्यतस्तदा स्वर्गं गमिष्यत इति अध्ययनं प्रति अपरः प्रोत्साह्यत इति ।

इति श्रीमहोपाध्यायभर्तृहरिविरचितायां श्रीमहाभाष्यदीपिकायां प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य द्वितीयमाह्निकम् ॥ प्रत्याहाराः समाप्ताः ॥

TRANSLATION

a i u Ṇ

[1]

"The open articulation of the phoneme *a*". Four internal manners of articulation, viz. occlusion etc., become operative in the application and non-application of the name *savarṇa*. Now the phoneme *a* is close, the phoneme *ā* open; if it is not included (in *a*) because of the absence of homogeneity, *ā* cannot undergo a grammatical operation (taught for *a* as a whole). Therefore open articulation (of *a*) is resorted to. (Objection:) But the manners of articulation of phonemes are fixed, like the fixed places of articulation; so, just as *i*, its place of articulation being fixed, cannot be pronounced by lips, or *a* by teeth, similarly how can *a* be pronounced open? Reply: Rare is the manner of articulation of a phoneme which cannot be effected (even) with care. This one, however, like a 'clipped' (sound), is possible with care. It is possible for this reason also, viz. that the open pronunciation is advocated.

[1. 1]

Here the word-element *-kāra* in *akāra* is a suffix (taught by) *varṇāt kāraḥ* (P. 3. 3. 108, *Vār*. 3). It means that this suffix (comes in) after a phoneme which conveys itself, without any addition of a new meaning; (it comes) after what denotes a phoneme. By the *a* in the Vārttika is denoted the *a* in the sūtra *aiuṆ*. Well, how does the suffix (come in) in *kakāra*? For, this (*ka*) is not a phoneme. What then? A cluster of phonemes. (Reply:) This defect (is) not (there). In fact it is for just such cases that it was said above: '(it comes) after what denotes a phoneme.' A consonant without a vowel cannot be pronounced; so the suffix *-kāra* (comes in) after a (consonantal) phoneme accompanied by a vowel, which (the cluster) denotes the phoneme. (The phoneme) which is conveyed is of course understood as the one without the vowel. Just as the phoneme *kh* and *ph* associated with the Jihvāmūlīya and the Upadhmānīya are pronounced, but (the Jihvāmūlīya and the *Upadhmānīya* which) are understood are pure only.

[1. 2]

(Objection:) The suffix *-kāra* being obligatory, the wording (*asya* in) *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32) is incorrect. It should be: *akārasya cvau*. Reply:

When the distinction of the denoter and the denoted is not intended, and (consequently) when there is the idea of identity in the form: 'this is that itself', then there is no denotativeness; hence the absence of the suffix. Or, on the strength of this very wording it should be understood that the suffix is not obligatory.

[1. 3]

"The open articulation of the phoneme *a*". (Objection:) The word *vivṛta* being expectant (of an outside word viz. *akāra*) has no syntactical connection and so cannot properly form a compound with the word *upadeśa*. Reply: *vivṛta* 'open' is a quality and the expectation, by a quality, of a possessor of the quality never ceases; so it (the word *vivṛta*) proceeds, (though) expectant. Or, being a qualifier of the whole (compound), it (i. e. the word *akāra*) will touch the member of the compound (also). Moreover, capacity to convey (the meaning of the corresponding phrase) is also spoken of there viz. 'Here the complex formation will take place because of the capacity (of the complex formation) to convey (the meaning of the corresponding phrase)'. Or the words *vivṛtena* and *upadeśaḥ* are first compounded (into *vivṛtopadeśa*) according to '*sādhanaṁ kṛtā ...*' (P. 2. 1. 33, *Vār*. 2); the *vivṛtopadeśa* 'open articulation' belongs to *a*, and so there is no defect.

[1. 4]

Well, now why is it said: 'The open articulation of the phoneme *a*'? For, from the very utterance of the sūtra it is understood that he has pronounced *a* as open. (The reply is that) some particular features of word (-pronunciation) are noticed by practice only; just as the (pitch) like Udātta etc. is known to the students of the Veda only, or the (musical notes) like *ṛṣabha*, *gandhāra* to the musicians only. Similarly this *vivṛta* is difficult to perceive without practice. So he says that (this *a*) is pronounced as open.

[1. 5]

Others hold that this (*a*) too is read in the *pratyāhāra* (-*sūtra*) in its reverted form. This one (the Vārttikakāra), however, having pronounced it for the sake of the announcement (of *vivṛta*), conveys *a*, (by which) is understood the closed *a*. Just as in *ṣṭhā gatinivṛttau* (P. Dh. I. 975) or *dhaḥ karmaṇi ṣṭran* (P. 3. 2. 181) (the word *ṣṭhā* or the word *ṣṭran*) which is pronounced is the cerebralised form conveys the form *sthā* or *tran* which is known to appear in the (actual) usage. Since the cerebralisation is technically non-existent only in the form current in the usage, the modification in the root etc. takes place. Such being the case, when the reversion is effected, ... (this *a* in the Śiva-sūtra is) a reproduction of only some one (*a*) in *aśva*, *arka* etc. on the individualistic

view. On the generic view, however, it is the universal which is imitated. Such being the case, on the reversion of (*a*) read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya, all other (*a* phonemes) are reverted, So they do not resort to reversion for the establishment of the form in words like *bhavati*.

[1. 6]

Others hold that this is neither an imitative name nor, reduced to its original form, a conveyer of any (*a*). What then? Meaningless, it is pronounced open, unreverted to its original form.

[1. 7]

" What is the purpose ? " " Meant for the comprehension of *ā* ". (Objection :) But the wording should be like this : *ākāragrahaṇam* ' comprehension of *ā* '. Reply : ...

[1. 8]

[Reply :] Sometimes a possessor of a property is named after a property, just as (a bull is named) *viṣāṇin* ' having horns ', *kakudmat* ' having a hump ', *prāntevāladhi* ' having a tail ', *sāsnāvat* ' having a dewlap '. (Time) when it is specifically named after it (a property in the matter of time) only gets a special (name), like *hrasva* ' short '. Or *dırgha* ' long '. Or again, *tricaturmātra* ' having three, four, moras '. Such being the case, at the stage when a sound produces another sound after the contact of the speech organs, the activity of the mouth (as the seat of organ of speech) is already over. So it is rightly said : " Duration is outside of the oral cavity ".

Even if the initial effort is accepted ... (even then) the particular physical activity from which the breath proceeds is external; thus the manner of articulation consisting of the breath of a particular kind takes place at the region of the navel itself. For this reason also there does exist the outwardness of the duration from the oral cavity.

[1. 8. 1]

(Objection :) But this conflicts with what is said (in the *Mbh.*) under *taparas tatkālasya* (P. 1. 1. 70). For, this is what is said there : ' The Sphoṭa is of the same duration (*Mbh.* I, 181. 21) ', there is only difference in the speed of utterance. Since, then, there is the same duration in all the speeds of utterance, here also the duration of the short and the long (phenemes) will be the same and consequently the substitution of *ais* will have to be done in *khaṭvābhiḥ*. Reply : This defect is not there, because of the admission of eternality. It is just for

such reasons that the eternality of words has been admitted. The manifestors of this eternal (word) are, again, some primary and some secondary. That (sound) which is produced by the contact of speech organs, and that (sound which is produced) from that (first sound), these two are primary, because the particular is perceived because of these two. The sound, however, which is produced (from the primary one) is secondary, as no particular is known from it. The only speciality (about it is) that it reveals (the phoneme) in this way. If there is a difference of duration because of absence of another word, then there is difference of duration in the fast, the medium, and the slow speech also. If (on the other hand) there is a repeated striking by speech-organs in the long and the prolated vowels then in that case, the externalness of duration in the case of the fast speed etc. is difficult to explain, as the striking by the speech-organs, then, does not yet cease.

[1.9]

" Now, this, is it ... etc. ". (This means :) Is this openness (something) new, not done by Pāṇini, (and is now) pleaded for (by Kātyāyana), or is this (merely) a justification of (something) already done (by Pāṇini)? " Since he teaches the reversion in (the rule) '*a a*' (P. 8. 4. 68) ". If *a* had been declared here as closed itself, what is the sense in its reversion? Such being the case it is concluded from the statement about the reversion that *a* (is) open — (the one) which is in the Pratyāhāra, the one mentioned in the form of *anuvṛtti* in the rule *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32), *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101) etc., and also the one in words in use, *aśva*, *arka*, *artha* etc. " For, there is another purpose in saying this ". This is the idea : This grammatical expression, viz. *a a*, it can reasonably refer only to *a* in the words which are used, (and) not to (*a* of) the alphabet consisting of the meaningless (phonemes). And this defect resulting out of speaker's carelessness, (viz.) openness, is there. It is also there because it is made by Pāṇini. Therefore in words which are used, like *atikhaṭva*, (a speaker) may pronounce (*a*) open. Hence the reversion. If, then, *a* has not been pronounced open (by Pāṇini), here is a question : If *a* is not open in the pratyāhāra Sūtras, and also in the *anuvṛtti* references, then, because of difference in the manner of articulation, neither *ā* nor its substitute will be homogeneous. When homogeneity is not there, there is no inclusion (of *ā* in *a*). Therefore there is not *ac*-ness in the original and also in the substitute. Neither the original nor its substitute (is there as an *ac*). Whose reversion, then? Here is the reply : It is concluded from an indicative sign that *ā* is replaced by *a*, since he (Pāṇini) refers (to *a* which has taken the place of *ā*) in the matter of the *i*-substitute (in the place of that *a*) in his rule [*udīcām*] *ātaḥ sthāne yakapūrvāyāḥ* P. 7. 3. 46). There is no *a* except (the one got by) shortening by *ke ' ṇaḥ* (P. 7. 4. 13).

If so, why is it not assumed that homogeneity (itself) is there on the strength of indication? And if homogeneity (is there), where is the need of (the declaration of) the open pronunciation or of the reversion? Here is the reply: Indication is like inference. Inference does not have a universal application. So we accept inference in a specific context (only). It is not homogeneity but the substitution (which is accepted) on the basis of indication. Or, the expression *go-strī* is read there (in P. 1. 2. 48). (If the substitute *a* does not come in the place of *ā*) reading of the word *strī* will be without any scope, (to avoid which) the substitute would come; but not the homogeneity.

" There, owing to affinity ". What is meant is that (the open *a*), resulting out of carelessness of the speaker, has the maximum affinity. " Neither in the world, nor in the Veda ". This is what is said : The defects which you have mentioned are due to carelessness of the speaker. Reversion need not be taught for removing them. There do exist defects like *kala*. But there is no reversion in their case, for they are removed by the *gargādi-bidādi* list. Similarly the (defective) open pronunciation of *a* also in the linguistic usage is (already) removed by the *gargādi-bidādi* list. So the reversion is a clue to this, viz. that Pāṇini himself is declaring (in the Śiva-sūtra) open pronunciation (of *a*). " Now, what is the difference here? " (Here) he is asking about the interpretative activity about the sentence. (What is meant is) that, since some unsaid predicate of the sentence has to be supplied, whether *kartavyaḥ* ' to be done ' or *kṛtaḥ* ' done ', there is no difference. " There is no (difference). Merely self-conceit ". [*aho-puruṣa*] is used for *ahaṁ-puruṣa*, (which means) self-conceited, one who looks upon himself as superior to others, conceited. (The suffix) *vuñ* (=*aka*) is added (to it) in the sense of *tasya bhāvaḥ* ' the state of being so ', as it is believed to be included in the *manojñādi* list (P. 5. 1. 133). *Āhopuruṣikā* means *ahaṁyutva* ' the state of being self-conceited '. " You are saying ". You have not said (what is) correct. But what I have said, that alone is proper, because of the statement of reversion.

[1. 10]

" Because of its open pronunciation ". (The *a*) read in the *akṣarasamāmnāya*, open (in pronunciation), reverted (subsequently) to close (*a*), is meaningless; it denotes (*a* read in the Śiva-sūtra) *aiuṇ* in the grammatical system only. (It does not denote any other *a*) unlike the *it*-sounds, (e. g. *ṭ* in) P. 3. 2. 123 : *vartamāne laṭ*, where the name *it* does not apply to (the sound *ṭ*) being actually uttered, but to the mental (sound) which is the object of phonetic changes; that (mental sound) is only denoted by this (one uttered in the sūtra. So the declaration of openness of *a* in the roots etc. is necessary). And if this is an *anukaraṇa* of (*a*- sounds in) full words, then, on the individualistic view of

utterances in the grammatical system this will be an imitation of only a particular (*a*),—so it is said "(the *a*) which is there in roots etc. also should be declared to be open". For, otherwise, because of the difference in the manner of articultation (the close *a*) will not be included (in the open *a*) of the *akṣarasamāmnāya*; in the absence of the *ac*-character and (consequently) of the status of the original, (the *a* of *śam*) cannot be replaced by a long vowel in the form *śāmyati*. The final vowel of a nominal stem cannot have an acute accent, (e. g.) in *dṛṣad*. No *āy* substitute (for *i* of *ci*) when a (vocalic) suffix follows, (e. g.) in *cāyaka*. The accent will not be there in *avagata*. "Since he (frames the rule): *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101)". This (*a* in *akaḥ*) is recognised as the same one read in the *akṣarasamāmnāya* by the sign, (viz.) the code-letter (*k*). Now if (the *a* in) roots etc. is not understood (by it), he would have simply said: *ikaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*. "For (there is no simultaneous existence) of two *a* sounds in the *akṣarasamāmnāya*". Although (even) a single one does not exist, this is said as the long (substitute) concerns two (originals). "For it". This may be for *ā*, as it is homogeneous (with *a*) because of its openness. "Why is this (particular) mode of articulation insisted on, viz. the open pronunciation?" This is just what he means: Why this partiality (for declaring *a* in roots etc. open)? For, the roots have to be read. When they are read, they do not cause any prolixity or brevity by the close or open pronunciation. "These nominal stems which are not read". The close *a* is used in (words like) *raṅka* etc., which are current in the world. These (words) are not mentioned in the grammatical system. And openness cannot be taught (or demonstrated) without uttering them. If they are uttered, the grammatical system becomes prolix. Therefore this has to be read: "(*a*) in roots etc. also (is) open". Now why is the word root read here, since the roots are read? Here is the reply: If this is said for the sake of (unlisted) nominal stems, it will also be (useful) for the roots. Thus then (the roots), as far as their pronunciation is concerned, will be pronounced close only, but they will be regarded as open in the matter of operation. In that case the change of articulation does not need to be stated.

[1. 11]

"For the prohibition of close (*a*) when a long or prolated (substitute) is taught". Some explain: a second purpose for the open pronunciation of (the *a*) in the *akṣarasamāmnāya* itself is stated (here). That one being close, (its) long and prolated (substitutes) also have to be close by (the condition of) closest affinity. Some explain this as stating the purpose of the open pronunciation (of *a*) in roots etc. Here, it may be further stated thus: Because of the closeness (of *a*) its status of the original with reference to the long and the prolated cannot reasonably be explained. "Neither in the world, nor in the

Veda ". He is adducing the usage of the *śiṣṭa*-s as the reason. The *śiṣṭa*-s do not utter the long and prolated (*a* sound) as close. " The original will cause these two ". Some hold that this rule is productive. The revered one however says : Just as the *śiṣṭa*-s use nasal semi-vowels, where it is concluded, on the strength of the Paribhāṣā : *sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 50) that nasal (semivowel) is allowed in this situation, similarly even though there may not be close long and prolated (vowels), they may have been allowed by reason of closest affinity. " The parallel is not fitting. It is reasonable that what exists, (that alone) can be produced ". Because of impossibility — that is what he means by this. Here something is possible; for instance it may be possible to walk on hands, but not on the head. Similarly, the phoneme *a*, long or prolated, is absolutely impossible to be pronounced close by anybody. Infinite are the phonetic defects. They are thus said : ' These are the types of the defects of vowels. Different from these are the defects of consonants ' (*Mbh*. I. 13. 25–27). The semivowels, however, can be pronounced nasally, but, here again, not so possible is (the sound) *r*. Two reasons have been given : (1) absence of usage among the *śiṣṭa*-s and (2) impossibility. " Even so, whence is this that ". And if it is said, how can there be similarity of mode of articulation of *a*, if it is to be close, with *ī* and *ū* which are open, — for, verily, it has been said : ' The mode of articulation of vowels and fricatives is open ' — with reference to this some say : ' *ī*, *ū* and *ṛ* are close, except in the *ārbhava* Sāman '. This is wrong. This is only a Prātiśākhya statement. Only in this recension there is close pronunciation in *sāmans* except the *ārbhava* one ; according to others there are open (*ī*, *ū* sounds) alone. Therefore this is what is meant by " even so, whence is this that ... ". (The object) is not achieved even if the openness of *a* (is declared). For, *a* is open, *ā* is more open and (similarly) *ī* and *ū* also are more open. The (substitutes) have to be those whose mode of articulation is the same. (But,) if so, there cannot be an inclusion (of *ā* in *a*). (The reply :) Inclusion will be there on the force of the statement. Or, when it is said ' open pronunciation ' (*vivṛtopadeśa*), what is meant is ' more open pronunciation ' (*vivṛtataropadeśa*). (But then) how is it said : ' the phoneme *a* which is there in the diphthongs is more open than other (*a*) ' (*Mbh*. I. 25. 14) ? That also should be understood in the sense of ' most open ' (*vivṛtatama*).

[2]

" Now, where there is a mention (of *a* etc. in the grammatical rules) which (*a* etc.) is merely similar (to *a* etc. read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya), there will be no inclusion of homogeneous phonemes in it because of the absence of *aṇ* character (in it) ". There is one (*a*) in ' *aiuṇ* ; another in *akaḥ savarṇe* ... (P. 6. 1. 101) ; an entirely pure (*a*) in *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32), *yasyeti ca*

(P. 6. 4. 148). There (in P 6. 1. 101 etc.).we know that (*a* there) is the same (as the *a* read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) on the strength of the code-letter. But in the case of (utterances of *a*) in the pure form there is no *aṇ* character. Such being the case, just as *ā* is always only a conveyed sound, never a conveying sound, similarly this (pure) *a* also is a conveyed sound only. So this (*a*) alone will undergo an operation, e. g. *śuklībhavati* ' becomes white '. *Mālībhavati* will not be (available). Similarly *cauḍiḥ bālākiḥ*.

[2. 1]

" Because of the oneness (of *a*) (the desired object is) achieved ". Because *a*-ness is pervasive.

[2. 2]

" But a confusion of (the effects of) code-letters (results) ", because of the factual non-difference of the *a* phoneme. It is so, e. g. in *karmaṇy aṇ* (P. 3. 2. 1) and *āto'nupasarge kaḥ* (P. 3. 2. 3). Just as, if a theft was committed by one who had a clean shaven head, it is not that he is not arrested as a thief, if he grows hair subsequently. Such being the case, in (the formation of) *goda* ' one giving a cow ', (the suffix) *ka* will be there because (P. 3. 2. 3 is) later (than P. 3. 2. 1). The furnishing of the code-letter *k* could be for the sake of the following (rule : P. 3. 2. 4). Or, since otherwise (P. 3. 2. 3) will have no scope at all, there will be an alternation (of the application of both rules).

[2. 3]

" *kiriṇā giriṇā* etc. ". (A stem in) *a* is not cited as illustration, because (acute accent on case ending is) prohibited (in the case of stems in *a*) by *na gośvansāvavarṇa* ... (P. 6. 1. 182). *Ghaṭena tarati* ' swims by means of a jar '. Only the utterance is twice ; the thing (i. e. the vowel *a*) is one. (The suffix) *ṭhan*, however, will find scope in *bāhuka* etc.

[2. 4]

" Behaviour like ordinary objects (would threaten " *Var*. 8). " Verily, many people do not perform an activity with a jar simultaneously ". (Activity) such as bringing ghee etc. (However, many people simulaneously) utter the *a*-sound occurring in *aśva, atka, ara* (etc.).

[2. 5]

" (The goal, however, is achieved) because the different signs have been affixed according to the context ". The Vārttikakāra mentions the instrument in general; the Bhāṣyakāra conveys the plurality and the status of location by

repetition and the Locative case (respectively). "He would have uttered a single (*a*), furnished with all the characteristic (letters)". He would have said that the suffix *kaṇt* comes (after verbal roots) when a grammatical object precedes as an Upapada. Or he would have uttered as many of them as he could. The others he would have declared as mentioned-and-dropped. "The name *it* would be (possible), at the most for two (sounds) only". (This construction with the gerund *āyamya* is justified) because the relationship of having one and the same agent (for *ā-yam* and *as*) is established by understanding that the name *it* 'code-letter' itself exerts for the sake of the grammatical system. Even then, the name *it* will be (possible) only for two; it will not be (possible) for the intermediate ones. "(The goal), however, is achieved because of the repetition of (the same) sign". (Objection:) But it could be for the sake of restriction, viz. that the effect of that (particular code-letter, uttered in a particular Sū.) alone takes place, not e. g. the initial high pitch etc. which is the effect of the code letters *ñ* and *n*. (Reply:) A restriction is understood, (only) when there is no injunction (teaching something new). This being so it will be understood that the effect of that (particular code-letter read in a particular Sū.) does not take place elsewhere. For, otherwise **śivādibhyaḥ aḥ* would have been the proper wording (of P. 4. 1. 112). "This is proved by (the practice of) the world." It is not (now) said (by us) that (Pāṇini) would have uttered a single (*a*), furnished with all the characteristic (letters). How then? (Reply:) An operation in connection with which a (specific) characteristic mentioned in so many words is resorted to, that takes place in the world only in connection with that which possesses that characteristic. In the case of theft, however, words like *muṇḍa* are not specifically mentioned. Such being the case, when it is stated that a person with a cleanly shaven head is not to do something, then one with a tuft of hair or with matted hair receives the operation; similarly here (in the grammatical issue involved) also, since the affixing of code letters is for some (specific) grammatical operation, (the grammatical elements) will get those operations in the specific contexts only. (Even then) how is it that the effect of the code-letter *ṇ* does not take place in the case of (the affix *a* in P. 4. 3. 9): *a sāmpratike*? Surely here is no (other) mark, and so lawlessness threatens here. (Reply:) The goal would have been achieved on the strength of exclusion if (the Sū. had been read as) *madhyān mo 'sāmpratike*; still the absence of the code-letter is resorted to (by Pāṇini), which is meant to indicate that the absense of a code-letter itself is (as good as) a mark. This being the case, just as somebody should be ordered: 'Be naked here!' similarly (the suffix) is ordered; 'Be without a code-letter here!'.

[2. 6]

" By the counting of repeated occurrences ". Here in the worldly practice where the number in the primary sense ... becomes seventeen, there the domain of repetition being uncertain, it is said : ' He repeats the first (*ṛc*) thrice ', ' he repeats the last one thrice ' (*Tait. Br*. 2. 5. 7). It means that the first and the last one have the number of repetitions. " (True,) the operation may take place by means of repetition, (but ...) ". The operation may take place there where plurality is laid down as a condition in the rule. But where singleness (is the condition), there the condition for it being intact the (undesired high) pitch becomes due in the examples *kiriṇā, giriṇā*. (Reply :) " This also is achieved ". A number is always cancelled by another number, whether (the latter is) primary or secondary. In grammar, for example, when the word *naidheya* is to be formed, if there is the extension of the status of the original, (the substitute) being trisyllabic the dissylabic character will be superseded and (the affix) *ḍhak* will not be available. That is why (this form) is cited (in the *Mbh*. under P. 1. 1. 57) in connection with the question : " why is (the word) *pūrvavidhau* ' when a preceding phoneme is to undergo an operation ' (read in the rule) ? " " It is like this : A thousand sages (having given) a tawny cow one by one ". There is a direct relationship of *ṛṣisahasram* ' a thousand Ṛṣis ' (with *sampannāḥ* ' became ') if (the compound is) of co-referential constituents. Or, if it is Genitive (-*Tatpuruṣa*), then the relationship is (indirect and) of the nature of semantic connection, as e. g. with the verb *bhuj* (e. g. in *brāhmaṇa-sahasraṁ bhojyatām*). They, it is said, having purchased it from one another with money, gave it away a thousand times. This giving away of an object which was taken (with price) is a gift. So, as a result of the gift of (a cow which was) only one, these (Ṛṣis) also were brought whenever it was said : ' Bring (persons) who have given away a thousand ! ' They were not brought when it was said : ' Bring (persons) who have given away one ! ' Just as here (in the *loka*) a (subsequent) number does set aside an earlier number, similarly here (in grammar) also. So there is nothing wrong.

[3]

" But (there *is*) plurality (of *a*), because of intervention by time and phoneme(s) ". This reason (is characterised) by similarity and dissimilarity — similarity with those of known plurality and dissimilarity with those of known oneness. Here (in the language) intervention by phoneme(s) is seen in the case of those whose mutual separateness is well known. This (is so) e. g. in the word *dṛti*, where (there is an intervention) of *ṛ* and *i* by *t*. Here also in the word *daṇḍa* (separation of) *a* following *d* and *a* following *ḍ* by *ṇḍ* is seen. This (separation) is not a property of a thing which is one. When this phoneme *a* is uttered

in isolation as '*a*', at that time there is no intervention of this (*a*) by a phoneme. Similarly, priority and posteriority, separated by time, is seen in the case of the uncoalesced phonemes *a i u* whose separateness is well known. However, there is no priority and posteriority, separated by time, in the utterance of an isolated *a* which is a single entity. But in the uncoalesced *daṇḍa agram* there is priority and posteriority separated by time. Therefore the phoneme *a* has plurality. (Objection :) Intervention by time is there in the intervention by phoneme(s) also. This being so (the plurality of *a*) is proved by the intervention of time alone. Reply: Intervention by time is (thus) shown to be twofold: (one) unaccompanied by phoneme(s) and (the other) accompanied by phoneme(s).

[3. 1]

" Also because of its appearence simultaneously at different places " (*Vār*. 12). There is an appearance of the phoneme *a* simultaneously at different places. This property is opposed to unity. " Verily, Devadatta, who is one, simultaneously " is not found to be at different places. The phoneme *a*, on the other hand, is so found. Therefore the phoneme *a* has plurality. Two reasons (were) advanced for plurality. (He now) gives reply to one. As to your argument *kālaśabdavyavāyāt*, about this we say : " supposing these phonemes are like birds ". This is what is meant : This interruption which you imagine (to be there in the phoneme *a*) (made) by time and by phoneme(s)— this is not an interruption in the thing in itself (i. e. the phoneme *a*). What then ? These are perception and non-perception (of *a*) due to the activity and the inactivity (respectively) of the manifesting cause. That (which is) the manifesting cause of the phoneme *a* does not manifest the phoneme *a* when it is not active while the cause of manifestation of another phoneme is active; but (it) manifests (it) when (it is) active again. Therefore this (interruption) is due to the activity and the inactivity of perception and non-perception, (and) not because of plurality in the thing (itself). Just as a bird in a row may go to another place with a quick flight. Is it possible to say here that the earlier bird (is one) and the later one is actually different (and that the earlier one) is concealed behind the other one ? This much, however, can be said : (The bird which was) not perceived previously (is) now perceived. With this idea he says : " Thus this phoneme *a*, seen in (the syllable) *da* " (i. e.) found to be in (the syllable) *da* " is seen in the syllable *ṇḍa* " (i. e.) found to be (in the syllable *ṇḍa*). " It is not possible this way. This way there will be transitoriness ". True, the solution (given by you) is based on reasoning. However, it is not the doctrine of Grammar. For, in Grammar eternality of a meaningful word is declared, (i. e.) either of an inflected word or of a sentence. And it is the whole that is regarded (as meaningful) in Grammar. The whole, further, consists of phonemes and nothing else.

Such being the case, if oneness be declared, that whole would not be available in (e.g.) *karka-*. (Here) the phoneme *k* is perceived twice and so also the phoneme *a*. So it is possible to say that (here is) a whole with the form *kar*. Similarly *kāruka* (will be reduced to) the form *kāru*. And this (*kar* or *kāru*) has simply no meaning as it is not in use. Therefore it has to be admitted that specific wholes (denote) the meanings, (wholes) which consist of different phonemes.

"Supposing these phonemes are like the sun". (This points out) the violation of the reason : 'Also because of its appearance simultaneously at different places" (*Vār.* 12). The appearance of the sun, though one, is witnessed in different places ... "The parallel is not appropriate." This (is what) he is saying : what I meant to say is that one and the same onlooker does not see Devadatta simultaneously in many places. Nor does (he) so see the sun. For the on-looker who is in Srughna is not the same as the one in Saurāṣṭrika. ... "(One and the same onlooker) does see the phoneme *a* (simultaneously in different places)". Even in the case of one who does not admit simultaneity of perceptions at any one moment, even for him perception of the phoneme *a* is of a different kind from that of the sun, because simultaneity of perceptions relating to a *muhūrta* is possible. And ether is not a single entity. So a single location of *a* is not reasonable. "(One) does not perceive even the phoneme *a*". If the phoneme *a* had plurality, then difference (of places) would be reasonable. Similarly there is only one location for word (viz.) ether. Therefore 'because of its appearance simultaneously at different places' is no reason.

"Perceived by the ear, grasped by the mind, illumined by the speech activity". Why is this brought in? The reply : In order to indicate the unfailing properties (of *śabda*). The perception by ear is unfailing. (Word) is never seen by eye. Similarly, because it is to be grasped by the mind, it is not grasped by anything else. Manifested by sound, it is not manifested by a lamp etc. Similarly, ether is unfailing. Therefore [there is no plurality of *a*]. As to (its) perception as being in many places although it has only one place, that is due to an extraneous cause. It is like naming (a word) 'distant' etc. as in the expressions : *dūraḥ śabdaḥ* 'a distant word', *saṁnikṛṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ* 'a proximate word'. The cognitions produced by the activity of the organ(s) present plurality even of (an object which is) one, as for example when a sound is uttered at a winding place another sound, similar to it, is heard. And cognitions in an indefinite form do proceed.—It was said by you : 'Verily, Devadatta, who is one, cannot be simultaneously in Srughna [and also in Mathurā]'. To that we say : one and the same earth is called Srughna at one place and Mathurā at another. Similarly, in the case of ether also, though it has a single region, people could speak about its plurality of regions.

" There are many regions of ether also ". (Objection :) The earth is produced by is parts. So the parts can be looked upon as (its) regions. But the ether is not produced. (Reply :) True. It is so. Those parts (of the earth), though essentially different, are described (as regions) because of the close contact. Similarly why should it not be understood that because of contact with trees etc. it is said : ' (This) ether here ', ' (this) ether here ' ? This much, however, is the difference : regions which are in contact are as if led to integration into a whole by the contact which is the cause of erroneous perception of the thing; led so much so that some believed in their temporariness. It does not make any difference if the parts and the whole are spoken of as regions (and the occupant of the regions repectively). Therefore, on account of the plurality of regions stands the reason : ' Because of its appearance simultaneously in different places there is a plurality of the phoneme *a* '.

[4]

" (The object) is achieved by understanding (the *a* as standing for) the class (*Vār*. 13) ". It is the class, and not an individual, that is mentioned in the Pratyāhāra (sūtra) and also elsewhere where *a* is (merely) similar (to *a* read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya). The (actual) resorting to an individual, however, is like this : (A stranger) is thus advised by an inhabitant of the Cocoa-nut Island : ' This (is) a bull. He should not be touched by you with (your) foot '. Although (the bull) directly shown (may be) young, black and thin, he (the stranger) does not touch even an old, variegated and fat one. — There is no interruption or delimitation of that class (or universal). Openness, and other properties which (are there), they all (come) through the individual. The open (*a*-) class is uttered in the Pratyāhāra (-Sūtra), and that (class) itself undergoes reversion at the end of the grammateal text. So everything is achieved. (Objection :) But on this (view), when the phoneme *ā* is mentioned, inclusion of *a* also become due. (Reply :) No, it does not become due, bacause of the difference in the mode of utterance. For example : ' A young Brāhmaṇa should be saluted by rising (from one's seat) '. But (the inclusion) of a prolated vowel (still) becomes due? Even there is this solution : ' A prolated vowel is sanctioned only in its proper domain ' (Śloka Vār. 2 on P. 6. 1. 87).

[4. 1]

" Hence the suffixion of *t* " (*Vār*. 14). *Tadvac ca*...means the same thing as *tathā ca taparakaraṇam* ' hence the suffixion of *t* '. " Because it has undesiredly an over-extension by the comprehension (of the homogeneous) ". Even when (the *aṇ* part of) the rule (P. 1. 1. 69) is rejected, the suffixion of *t* still remains doubtful : Does it enjoin (the inclusion of the homogeneous) on the

individualistic (view of) meaning ? Or does it ward it off on the universalistic (view) ? Therefore, just as the rejection implies the understanding of the class, similarly in the case of (the vowels) with the suffixion of *t* there is an understanding of the class.

[4. 2]

" Also where the consonants are mentioned " (*Vār*. 15). There the rule of inclusion of the homogeneous has no application. The phoneme *t*, conveying a (single) individual (*t*), has been read in the Pratyāhāra(-sūtra) as an imitative name of it (i. e. *t*) belonging to it (i. e. the grammatical system). It could be (taken as an imitative name) of one (*t*), either the preceding or the following. This being the case the elision (of *s* of *sic*), which depends on (both) the preceding and the following (*t* sounds being *jhal*) will not take place by *jhalo jhali* (P. 8. 2. 26). Where, then, will it take place ? (There) where the two *jhal* sounds have (mutually) different forms, as in *abuddha*, *abuddhāḥ*. On the universalistic view of meaning, however, the objective is achieved as the class is mentioned.

[4. 3]

" Or, on account of the commonness of form ". What kind of a solution is this ? Here some explain (thus) : There would be no harm even if (the concept of) class is not (admitted), as in the case of the Kārṣāpaṇas etc. (there is no harm) even in the absence of (the concept of) class ... Moreover, this thing, (called) the object itself is of such a nature that there is no loss of (its) identity. So there is no such thing as a word-class. The revered one, however, explains (the sūtra thus) : (The object) is achieved because a class just consists of commonness of form '. That is why this (phoneme, viz. *a*) has been resorted to. With reference to this it could be (said by way of objection) that this is already said viz. that (the object) is achieved because of the understanding of the class. But it is not (so said already). What was said before is that a class is expressed by a word. Since the class is expressed, (the object) is achieved. Now (i. e. in the present explanation), however, although the individuals are taught — and not the class — since (it is) the individuals (which) are expressed, still, even in this way, (the object) is achieved. How ? This one (opponent) should, in the first place, be asked this (question) : This (property viz. the phoneme *ā*'s) being different (from *a*) — is it due to the different pronunciation, (as e. g.) this phoneme *i* is different from the phoneme *a* ? Or due to some particular feature ? Due to particular feature, says he. In the matter of identity and difference (he continues) an object is regarded either as the same or as different on the strength of some reason. If so, (we now ask :) why do you regard the phoneme *ā* as different (from *a*) by reason of its particular

feature and not the same as it because of the common feature? Perhaps it may be (your) idea that the practice in the world is (marked) by difference only. But it is not so. The practice in the world is by identity also, e. g. in 'we are wearing the same shawls ...'. Therefore, he is saying that the class, though not expressed (as such by the word), is the cause of the understanding of identity.

ṛḷK/. 2

[1]

"Why is the utterance of the phoneme *ḷ* being specifically inquired into?" The purpose of uttering all the phonemes (in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) has been (already) stated in a general way. So the very same can be the purpose of this (*ḷ*) also. Or, *viśeṣeṇa* means 'in a different way'. The other phonemes, indeed, are inquired into in a different way — the phoneme *a* also (was inquired into) for its openness, *r* and *h* (will be inquired into) for their earlier or later utterance, (and) the *antasthā*-s for their utterance among the *aṇ*-(phoneme)s. This one (viz. *ḷ*) is, however, discussed in a different way. "The scope for use (of *ḷ*) is very little comparatively". This (is what) he says: The utterance of phonemes (in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) is for (helping) the working of the science (of grammar). And the science (of grammar) is for (explaining) the linguistic usage. And there is no such usage of the phoneme *ḷ*. In ***alpīyān*** 'comparatively very little', a higher degree (of rarity) as compared with *ṛ* (is meant). The scope for the use of the phoneme *ṛ* is small. Of this one (i. e. *ḷ*), it is still smaller. Perhaps it may be said that whatever (small or great) the scope of use may be, it has to be taught (in the Akṣarasamāmnāya). That is why he says: "Whatever scope of use (for *ḷ*) is there, it is restricted to (the *ḷ*) in the verbal root *kḷp*; and the *l*-character (of *ḷ*) in *kḷp* is technically non-existent". Such being the case those operations which depend upon (the name) *ac*, such as the Udātta pitch, they are available in the *ṛ*-stage itself. "There is no purpose (to be served) by uttering *ḷ*".

[1. 1]

"(The utterance of *ḷ* is) for spontaneity (in names), for the imitative names (of words containing *ḷ*) through incapacity (to utter *ṛ*) and for operations like prolation" (*Vār*. 1). As regards what was said viz. that the science (of grammar) is for (explaining) the linguistic usage, and that there is no *ḷ* which has realized itself in the usage, (well,) there is the usage of the phoneme *ḷ* in spontaneous (words) etc. Spontaneity (in names) is that which, in the absence of a cause for application (of a name to the named) belonging to the object (named), proceeds or retires without a restrictive cause for proceeding or retiring

(respectively). To explain : The word Ḍittha, (for example,) based on its (phonetic) form alone, (proceeds to name) wherever it is employed (by the naming person, thinking) ' I shall make this itself his name '. And it retires (from others). In the case of words which are based on their form alone, there is no other word which would replace them, because the own form cannot be conveyed by any other form. Such being the case, the word *ḷtaka*, being used as a name, not expecting an external cause (for its application), having no other word which would replace it, and is based on its own form, is correct. Why should it be not used ? Therefore, since there is a usage of a word containing *ḷ*, it has to be uttered (in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) to make possible (for it) the operations which are due to *ac* phonemes, — unless, (of course,) the statement : *ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ savarṇavidhiḥ* (P. 1. 1. 9, *Vār*. 5) is accepted. For, when it is there. ... " The proceeding of words is fourfold ". (He) conveys this by this (expression) : Some words have specific meanings. And the synonyms of these words are specific. (These words) cannot have been created by man because, in their case, there is no remembrance (of their) maker. But, on the other hand, there is a body of words which is used as a name, is not restricted to any one meaning, and is employed by human activity.

[1. 2]

There, when a class-word applies itself to the class in general, then, since no cause is expected (by it), it is possible to say that it is a *yadṛcchā*-word. For there is a human activity here, (though) different. Effort cannot be directed by man towards it. But this is the difference : when (the class-word) applies itself to an individual in view of the cause, it is then a class word. However, when an individual (is) its directly expressed meaning, then it is a *dravya*-word (individual name). Similarly a quality-word also. A quality-word like *śukla* ' white ' is a *yadṛcchā*-word with reference to quality-in-general, a class-word with reference to an individual in view of the cause, viz. a quality, and a quality-word because of its directly expressing a quality. Similarly, an action-word is a *yadṛcchā*-word with reference to action-in-general, a class-word with reference to an action (in view of the cause) and an action word (because of its directly expressing the action). In whatever word there is a connection with action, every such word has the status of action-word, in primary and in secondary nouns.

Others think : It is because of the imposition of the class (universal) (on them) that those objects get those names.

Yet some others think : These are *yadṛcchā*-words themselves, the class etc., however, are only qualifiers.

Therefore, in the (first) three kinds of word-application, there is a specific form and a specific meaning. In the fourth word-application, however, there is a personal element (i. e. a voluntary activity).

[1. 3]

" For the imitative names (of words containing *ḷ*) through incapacity (of the original speaker to utter *ṛ*) ". Now, what (kind of word) can this be ? It cannot be a *yadṛcchā*-word, for that matter, because its use is fixed. (Reply :) So this is a class-word (which) denotes (the quoted word) *ḷtaka* as possessing the universal (viz., *ḷtakatvam*) which inheres in the quoted word, as e. g. in the case of *ghaṭa*, the word *ghaṭa* ' jar ' denoting that (object) which is qualified by jarness is called a class-word. Further, that (original) word *ḷtaka* cannot be conveyed by any other imitative name; so the imitative name containing *ḷ* cannot be set aside by any other word.

[1. 4]

" For (operations) like prolation ". The *ḷ*-substitution being an accomplished fact in (the context of) prolation, circumflex accent and reduplication, *ḷ* of *kḷp* necessitates (its) utterance.

[2. 1]

" Because of the existence of the correct (word), employment (of that alone) in names etc. (is reasonable) " (*Vār*. 2). The correct word *ṛtaka* exists. — But whence its correctness ? Because of its use among the men of learning and culture. Just as in the case of class-words etc. (one says) ' These words are so many only (and not more) ' on the basis of instruction having an unbroken tradition, similarly the spontaneous words also are of this nature. Such being the case, just as in the case of (words expressive of) classes etc., words are not coined (by the speaker) himself, similarly with the spontaneous words also. Surely it is not possible (for one to say :) ' I shall make the cawing of a crow or the warbling of a swan the name of this one ', and give such a name, because it has not been the practice of a man of education and culture. " In names etc. ". By ' etc.' similarity is conveyed.— But which words are similar to name(s)? Even those (name-like words), *mleccha* (in character), which are coined and whose sphere is (some special) dialogue or asssembly, even these should not be made by coining words oneself. Or, by *saṁjñādiṣu* (are meant) these names based on class, quality or activity; of all of these, the spontaneous words form the beginning. Surely (they) do not attach themselves to meanings without expecting some other cause. Therefore, that one alone among the spontaneous words which form the initial names be employed, which is regular. " Some other one says ".

By this (he) says this: There is well founded Smṛti also in this respect. Such being the case, we learn from the injunction of the *śāstra* also that such is the practice of the men of learning and culture. This is (what is) said: (that word) should be adopted which is established; it is not proper to adopt, simply on the basis of its existence alone. The words like *ḷtaka* do not exist at all; so they should not be used. And the men of learning and culture regard both the establishment (of a word) and the science of grammar as necessary. You, on the other hand, throwing both to the wind, are taking your stand on the existence (of the word) only. Further, it is just for this reason, that men of learning and culture imitate an indistinct (sound) by a distinct one, as e. g. *paṭapaṭāyati*; not by by a similar (i. e. indistinct) sound.

"This spontaneous word, for that matter, is unavoidable". Above it was said, viz. 'the word *ṛtaka* is accountable by grammar', since it is explained by means of the suffix *kvun* added to the *niṣṭhā* (past passive participle) derived from the verb *arti* or, *ṛtaka* is from *ṛtīyati*. But (the word) *ṛphiḍa* is not so explained, and so also *ṛphiḍḍa*. Therefore here is this (word) also (with a legitimate *ḷ*), viz, *ḷphiḍa*. Here is the reply to this (objection): "Even this one is (really) *ṛphiḍa* and *ṛphiḍḍa*. For, the use of *arti* (as a verb) is alone seen in the world". In the matter of (words) like *ṛtaka arti* (i. e. *ṛ*) alone is read in the Dhātupāṭha, not the phoneme *ḷ*. And it is possible to look upon *-phiḍa* and *-phiḍḍa* as two suffixes, in view of (the *Vār.* on P. 3. 1. 1): *pratyayataḥ prakṛteś ca tad ūhyam*. Or *artipravṛttiḥ* (may be explained in a different way, viz.) that the use of *arti* itself is seen (in *ḷphiḍa*) in a modified and corrupt way. In the world, a wandering Gandharva is called *ḷphiḍḍa*. They say quite a lot in this way. It is (indeed) so. Or, here also this objection is there: Men of learning and culture do not use *ṛtaka* alone. What then? (They) use *ḷtaka* also. A corrupt name like *ḷphiḍḍa* may be given; this is the doctrine. It is a Smṛti having a seen effect, like the eating of a swan's flesh. And it does seem to be followed, this eatability (of a swan's flesh) being looked upon as sanctined in the Smṛti. Men of learning and culture, however, do not approve of a corrupt (name) like a *mleccha* name.

Having thus refuted (the reading *ḷ* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) for the sake of spontaneous words, (the Vārttikakāra) (now) refutes (the same) also for the sake of imitation (of a form with *ḷ*) which was originally so uttered on account of incapacity (of the original speaker to utter *ṛ*):

[2. 2]

"Imitation of what is taught and of what is neither taught nor prohibited" (*Vār.*). Only that is imitated by men of learning and culture what is

either taught, or what is neither taught nor prohibited. That, on the other hand, which is prohibited is not imitated, just because it is (already) done by somebody. A corrupt word is incorrect and it should not be imitated ... even though, the content is Vedic, still the words being worldly, he says 'in the world'. This one, however, viz. *viśvajitaḥ sattrāṇy āsate* 'the world-conquerors sit at sacrificial sessions' is read in the Veda also.

"The parallel is not appropriate". This is what is (meant to be) said: Neither merit nor sin (results) from (mere) imitation. What then? From giving (liberally) or from observance (of religious vows). Moreover, it is possible to say that this is no imitation at all. Where there is seen some (merely externally) resembling activity, that is no imitation, this is what he shows by *yas tu khalv idam asau* etc. "(First) bathed and (then) annointed". This is a sign of mental ease. A bad act is undertaken with an uneasy mind. "Having a garland on the neck". A sign of openness. For, a Brāhmaṇa, drinking liquor, will drink it secretly. This one, however, has a garland of flowers on his neck. Even though there is a possibility of the suspicion of liquor-drinking, even then there is the cutting of the plantain tree (which clinches the issue). Moreover, even (if) there be imitation of similar (things), there is no harm there. Men of learning and culture do indulge in such imitation. If one were to *use* the word *ḷtaka* with the intention of conveying meaning, in imitation of the Brāhmaṇa lady who had used that word (erroneously) in order to convey meaning, then there will be sin (on the part of the imitator); since, however, he uses it to convey the word (itself), so even this does not lead, even like the drinking of milk, to any sin.

"The very word *apaśabda* will be an incorrect word for him". For, the whole body of incorrect words, *gāvī* and others, all of them are denoted by it. So, there is no incorrectness-of-word (about the imitated *ḷtaka*), owing to the difference of meaning (between the two utterances of *ḷtaka*), just as the word *goṇī* is correct when meaning a bag, but incorrect when meaning an animal with a dew-lap etc. It could be (said by way of objection): This is an incorrect word as it cannot be explained by grammar. (The reply is that) it is a correct one since it can be explained by grammar e. g. by *arthavat ... prātipadikam* (P. 1. 2. 45).

"Further, this one also". What is the speciality about this? Here is the reply. Even this cannot be said about it viz. that this is an imitation of an incorrect (word). "If (this is an imitation of *ḷ*) in the verb *kḷp*". This is (what is) said: This is already taken care of. This is the one which exists in the usage, and the rule *pūrvatrāsiddham* (P. 8. 2. 1) does not apply to the usage; that is why he says: "Maybe there will be no necessity (of reading *ḷ*)

for the sake of it (i. e. *ḷ* in *kḷp*); but this (*ḷ* for whose sake the reading is necessary) is quite different, having for its denotation (the phoneme *ḷ*) which is there in the root *kḷp* ".

" An imitative name is like the original ". Although (this) statement is there, this rule of interpretation sometimes does not operate. When a speaker imitates, resorting to the form of a grammatical element, and not to its meaning aspect, then, since it is not meant to be a verbal root, that property (rootness) is already lost in the original itself and so it does not lead to the grammatical operation which is (ordinarily) caused by it. For instance, there is no *iyaṅ* substitute in *viparābhyāṃ jeḥ* (P. 1. 3. 19). When (he) resorts to the meaning aspect, then it is an imitative name of a verbal root, and so (he) accepts the *iyaṅ* substitute, as in *parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ* (P. 1. 3. 18) (which is already) seen in the *prakṛti*. " He said twice : *pacantu* ' let them cook ' ". This (word viz. *pacantu*) is not a finite verb-form, since a finite verb-form (is that which) expresses a participant in the action. Similarly, *agnī jvālitau* ' two fires are kindled ' is said (by somebody). (Somebody else) quotes him : ' he says *agnī* '. Here, dual number is (used) (for a nominal stem) when there are two objects (to he denoted), (or singular) when a word brings out a single (object), not for any other (nominal stem).

Here, however, this much has to be said : (When the phoneme *ḷ*) present in (the roots) *gam-ḷ*, *sṛp-ḷ*, *muc-ḷ* is quoted (thus :) ' he utters the phoneme *ḷ* well ', at that time (the maxim) ' an imitative name is like the original ' is not available. And if you think that this (*ḷ*) which is in *kḷp* is itself affixed to roots (*like gam-ḷ*) etc. ...

" If an imitative name is like the original, then (*ḷtaka in*) *brāhmaṇy ḷtaka ity āha* necessarily becomes an incorrect word ". (For) the original of imitative name (is) used to convey meaning ; (that) is an incorrect word. The incorrectness comes in because an imitative name acquires the properties of the original. And it is the practice of the men of learning and culture that an incorrect word should not be used. So as far as the maxim *prakṛtivad anukaraṇaṁ bhavati* is concerned, that is accepted as the original, which original is taught as authoritative. For example, in the rule *sthānivad ādeśaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 56), that *sthānin* is resorted to (which is taught as authortative). And surely in grammar no *ḷ* is taught as an original with an incorrect character, for the reason that correct (words alone) are explained by grammar. And if a word is (accepted as) explained by grammar as incorrect on the basis of inference, even then no original can be accepted merely on the strength of this indirect evidence.

Or, it is the grammatical operation that is extended by the maxim *prakṛtivad* etc. And surely there can be no grammatical operation with regard to an incorrect word. Certainly it is not possible to explain the incorrectness of a word by grammar. Whatever a word-form that can undergo a grammatical operation, even there it is not possible to extend word-incorrectness. Therefore, because of the absence of the original, because the property belonging to it has not been accepted by grammar, and because (the word-incorrectness) cannot be extended to the imitative name, it is said : A word, though imitative of an incorrect word, (itself) is not an incorrect word. Thus stands (justified) the reading of the phoneme *ḷ* for the sake of an imitative name (of words containing *ḷ*) through incapacity (to utter *ṛ*).

Others, however, explain that (this purpose) is repudiated (by the Bhāṣyakāra). 'That becomes necessarily an incorrect word' because 'its original is an incorrect word'. " And no incorrect word ". The remainder of (this) sentence is : 'is qualified to form the purpose'. Whence so ? (This) other one says : " Therefore no incorrect words are taught ". " And there is no original which is not taught ". ...

[2. 3]

" prolation etc. (can take place) because what is modified in a part does not lose its identity " (*Vār*. 4). It should not be understood here that (the continued identity) is due to understanding (*ḷ* as) substitute. For, if it is so understood, then prolation cannot take place because it is a phonetic operation. Therefore a popular convention itself is understood here. (Objection :) But in the world the recognition of a dog (is there), because of the continuation of the species (dogness). (Reply :) Well, here also there is a continuation of the (sound-) species. For, if the rule declaring the homogeneity (of *ṛ* and *ḷ* is there) and when the rule of comprehension (of the homogeneous, i.e. P. 1. 1. 69) is refuted on the basis of the class-view, then, in spite of the auditory difference the unity of class *is* there, as between a short and (the corresponding) long (vowel).

" (In the formation of) *rājakīya* by *rājñaḥ ka ca* (P. 4. 2. 140), *allopo'naḥ* (P. 6. 4. 134) will wrongly operate ". He thinks thus : There is continuation of memory owing to continuation of some property ; so the notion 'that one (is) the same as this one' arises. Such being the case, after the phoneme *k* is made (the substitute for *n*), the continuation of *k* causes continuation of the memory (of *n*). So he formulates the rule : " of what is mentioned in the Genitive ". The identity (belongs to) that which is mentioned in the Genitive at the time of (the laying down of) modification. And in the present case, at the

time of the teaching of (the substitute) *k*, there is Genitive of *rājan*, not of *an*. So, it is (the word) *rājan*, and not *an* (that could, at the most, be regarded as identical in spite of modification). " The *pluta* (vowel) does not become available in *kḷptaśikha* ' having a well-clipped tuft of hair '. For it is not the phoneme *ṛ* that is mentioned in the Genitive. What then ? The phoneme *r* ". So there is no identity in the matter of prolation. " Even the phoneme *ṛ* is mentioned here in the Genitive ". The word-form is peculiarly Sūtrian, (to be explained by) *supāṁ suluk* (P. 7. 1. 39). In the case of the (Genitive) *ur*, relationship in general is resorted to. It sometimes qualifies the phoneme *r* which may directly be a part, as in *kḷpta*. In *kalpak(ār)a* etc. it may be through relation with the related. " Mention of the (word-element) ending in *n* ". There is no status of (a word-element) ending in *n* in *rājakīya*. Verily, when the tail is cut off, a dog is not called as one possessed of a tail. " Here then, in *kḷptaśikha*, prohibition (of prolation) becomes due because of the expression *anṛtaḥ* ' not of *ṛ* ' (in P. 8. 2. 86), because the phoneme *ṛ* is modified in a part. " I will say : *aravataḥ* ' not of a (phoneme) containing *r* ' ". (Objection :) But (the possessive suffix) *matup* should not come in here. This is the reply : *matup* is employed to convey a special meaning. If, (instead of *aravataḥ*) *arasya* is used, then the prohibition will apply to *vartaka* also. This too has a phoneme *r* nearby. Therefore, (a particular) possession, (viz.) in the form of a part, is intended, as in the case of *viṣāṇin*. However, this has to be said here : A Bahuvrīhi also is prohibited in the meaning of ' immediate '. Therefore (*aravat*) should be included in (compounds like) *sarvabījin, sarvakeśin*. " This one, by modifying the sūtra ". This is what is said ... " This one, from a bamboo clump ". Because of the similarity of form, this has a similarity with that action.

e o Ṅ / ai au C / 3, 4

[1]

(Objection :) The being read (in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) of the diphthongs as (either) with a suffixed *t* (or) as without the suffixed *t* is discussed in the Bhāṣya passage. Owing to the absence of attaining a concrete form, its connection with *idam* ' this ' cannot be reasonably explained. (Reply :) This defect is not there. For, (an idea) which is (still) based on word cannot be connected when it is expressed by such kind of a word, e. g. *pacaty apatyam* ' (he) cooks, the offspring '; (but) when (the word) presents the object form in the mind, at that time every content is in the form of mind. Will it not then be connected viz. as *pacatis tasyāpatyam* ' the offspring of him (who) cooks ? ' The same sentence-meaning is expressed by a non-substantive word for the reason that (i. e. as long as) this object does not have a concrete form. (But

subsequently) it is said to be concrete and so it is referred to by (the pronoun) *idam*. Similarly here also the sentence-meaning, no longer resorting to its word-basis, (and) existing in the mental form, is connected with *idam*.

[2]

" What difference (is) there ? " (He) is asking about the difference in (grammatical) operations. What is gained if (the diphthongs are) read with a suffixed *t* and (what) if not so read ?

[2. 1]

" If there is an *upadeśa* of a suffixed *t* in the diphthongs, (there should be their) utterance with a suffixed *t* ". What sort of a mode of expression is this : *taparopadeśaś cet taparoccāraṇam*, as it is said that ' the root *diś* means to utter ' ? It is (as good as) saying : *taparoccāraṇaṁ cet taparoccāraṇam* ' if (there is) an utterance of *t*, an utterance of *t* '. Reply : This (is what he) is arguing : Just as in the case of others, there is, for that matter, their utterance ; but (there is) also their withdrawal, because of (some) rule, (and so) they are not heard, as e. g. (the suffixes) *cuñcūp* and *caṇap*, both beginning (in the grammatical system) with *y*. Similarly, if there is an utterance (i. e. reading) of *t*, there is no rule for its withdrawal. That is why it is said : ' (their) utterance should be done with a suffixed *t* '. Or, *upadeśa* also consists of making something known through its qualities. If the diphthongs are read with a suffixed *t*, then they do not become known as being with a suffixed *t* if they are uttered without a suffixed *t*. Or, *taparopadeśa* refers to the result of suffixing *t*. If you think the result of *t*-suffixion as desirable, there should be an utterance with suffixed *t* in the diphthongs.

[2. 1. 1]

Saṁdhyakṣarāṇi — this is a technical term of the older teachers. It is significant, because of the uniting parts : the earlier and the later parts of these (are such as) unite.

[2. 1. 2]

There is difference of opinion regarding the text here. One (scholar) is of the opinion that only *e* and *ai* have a suffixed *t* ; *o* and *au* get the suffixion of *t* on the basis of the statement ' what follows *t* has also (to be regarded as having) an affixed *t* ' (*Mbh*. I. 23. 20). If all were to have a suffixed *t*, then (this *t*) will not have the technical name *it* ' a code letter ' itself in *o-t-ṅ* and *au-t-c*, for *t* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya is not (then) final. But what purpose (is served) by *t* having the name *it* ? ... ' In the matter of the (word-element) furnished

with a code-letter *t*, 'suffix' should be mentioned" (P. 6. 1. 185, *Vār.*). (Svarita) should not be here viz. (in *aut*, occurring in) *diva aut* (P. 7. 1. 84). Therefore it is to be admitted that the name *it* is there (for *t*) in (the phonemes read) with a suffixed *t*. Therefore, (*t*) which is uttered in *diva aut*, has the name *it*. That being the case, that (*au*), which is conveyed by (*au*) furnished with a code-letter *t*, receives that operation — the named receives the operations. — It may be so, because there is no other function for making the *t* '*it*' there. In the present case, however, the *t*-suffixion, meant for another purpose, is already fully utilised; how can then it be a cause of that designation in the named ? — (This) defect is not there, because a code-letter has many functions. A code-letter is seen having more than one function. In *ṭhak* etc., e. g., (the code-letter) *k* is meant for (indicating) Vṛddhi and (a particular) accent. The name *it* should be taught everywhere.

According to others, a diphthong conveys its own form while conveying, at the same time, (others) having the same duration. But that (*au* etc.) to which is assigned the operation of an element with a code-letter *t* is itself without such a code-letter *t*. Why ? Because of the absence of utterance of (the phonemes) to be conveyed. There is no means of uttering them. Even then, the name *it* has to be taught for the *t* of the diphthongs. For, otherwise the form of the name will include *t*, as the dipthong with the suffixed *t* denotes (vowels) of the same duration. Once the own form is denoted there will be no name *it* owing to the absense of *upadeśa*.

Well, how is it that there is no understanding of the own form here ? Some say : But which is the name here ? 'the initial (part), ' says he, 'the final (*t*) is only a qualifier '. If so, the initial part alone is meaningful, because of its function as a name while the code-letter is just like the cawing of a crow and so (there will be) an absence of case ending unlike *ikaḥ*, *aci*. Therefore the whole (*au-t* etc.) is the name. Even though the whole is so ... still the last one withdraws on account of the name *it*. Here (i. e. in *o-t-ṅ* and *au-t-c*), however, if the name *it* is not there (for *t*) because of its not being the final, the own form will have to be accepted as including *t*. The form to be conveyed, however, which is of the same duration, (is) without *t*. It is like this : when (it is said :) 'Bring (a person) of the same size as the one with the white garment', the white garment does not form a part of the action of bringing which refers to the other man; but when the activity (of bringing) refers to the original man, *tadguṇasaṁvijnāna* 'understanding (of something) along with its qualifier' is there. Similarly, the suffixion of *t* is merely an external indication when referring to others, but when it refers to itself, *t* also is included. Or provision will be made for the name *it*. There is no difficulty (in this) because of the distinction

between the whole and the part. The phoneme *ṅ* is the code-letter of *e* / *o*, the phoneme *t* (is that) of *o*; similarly the phoneme *c* is the code letter of *ai* / *au*, the phoneme *t* (is that) of *au* only. It is like this : the phoneme *ṭ* of *suṭ* (is a code-letter) of the whole, *ṅ* (of *auṅ*) is that of its part.

One who reads (only) two phonemes (viz. *e* and *ai*) with a suffixed *t* is thus asked : How do you account for the *t*-suffixion status of the other two (viz. *o* and *au*) ? He replies : Even that which follows *t* (is to be regarded as) having an affixed *t*. — But this is not yet established here. It is not established, because (the Bhāṣyakāra) will state this later on. — Doesn't matter. Even that which is established is introduced again and again as an architect does. So he will state this again under *vṛddhir ādaic* (P. 1. 1. 1).... Therefore, it is merely a different form of declaration, whether all (should be) with a suffixed *t* or two with the suffixed *t*.

Well, why cannot (*at*- in) *ato bhisa ais* (P. 7. 1. 9) be a *pratyāhāra* (of *a*) with *t* of the diphthongs, as e. g. in *aci* ? — What will happen (if such a *pratyāhāra* is understood) ? — There will be substitution of *ais* (for *-bhis*) in *agnibhis, vāyubhis, gobhīs, naubhis*. — Now, why is there no understanding of the own form ? — What will happen (if it is so understood) ? There will be substitution of *ais* (for *bhis*) in *bhavadbhis*. (And) if (it is said that) the (intended) specific understanding follows from the commentarial explanation, then we will explain that here (in P. 7. 1. 9) also we shall explain that this (*a*) is with a suffixed *t* (and not the *pratyāhāra at*).

[2. 2]

" Operations dependent on prolation etc. (will not take place) ". (Here) Pluta is taken for granted and the defect like (unavailability of) reduplication etc. are pointed out, just as shortening and the elision of *y* are taken for granted and prohibition of an operation which concerns a verbal root and that of *tuk* is taught.

[2. 3]

Now (he) challenges the Pluta itself, saying " Also the name Pluta ". (A vowel) having three moras is not conveyed (by a vowel of two moras) on account of difference in duration. (When a three-mora vowel) does not have the (basic) status of *ac* itself, it cannot be named Pluta. Such being the case, that Pluta which is nearmost in some way or another, e. g. *ī* or *ū*, presents itself. In these circumstances, reduplication in *gotrāta* etc. can be explained, but the undesired (vowel) with three moras will be heard.

[3]

" If there is no *t*-suffixion, (the rule P. 1. 1. 48 :) *eca ig ghrasvādeśe* (has to be read) " (*Vār.* 4). If, on the other hand, there is *t*-suffixion, half e has no *ac* status owing to difference in duration, (and) so it does not have the designation *hrasva* ' short '. " But, sir, even for him who subscribes to *t*-suffixion ". This is (what is) said : That a rule has to be framed is common (to both views). But this is the difference : (In the sū. as it is) *ecaḥ* occurs; now (after *t*-suffixion) one will have to read as *aica ig ghrasvādeśe.* Further, since *a* of *ai* and *au* is a non-coalesced (constituent), half *e* and *o,* in which *a* has coalesced, do not become the substitues. " This is (going to be) refuted (by the *Vār* :) *aicoś cottarabhūyastvāt* " (P. 1. 1. 48, *Vār.* 4). The component *a* has a half mora, the component *i* and *u* one and a half moras (each) — this is the break-up. Such being the case, just as the designation *brāhmaṇagrāma* ' a village of Brāhmaṇas ', or *śāla-vanam* ' a Sāl forest ' owes itself to the majority, similarly here also. " This also is (going to be) refuted (by the *Vār.* :) *siddham eṅaḥ sasthānatvāt* " (P. 1. 1. 48, *Vār.* 3). How is this (going to be) refuted there ? — The half *e* and the half *o* simply are not there. And if they are not there, a palatal is homogeneous with a palatal, and a labial with a labial. Thus the authors of *Śikṣā* opine that they are labial and palatal. Here, since there is no experience of (half *e* and) half *o*, it is understood that there is a difference of opinion among the phonetic manuals. How (is) there an auditory difference (from $\breve{\bar{i}}$) if *e* and *ai* are (purely) palatal, and (from $\breve{\bar{u}}$) if *o* and *au* are (purely) labial in as much as their place and manner of articulation etc. (become) identical ? — Since there are different views (about the manner of articulation), there is no defect. Some opine : the breath, which produces speech-sounds, merely touches that part of velum which is near to it at the time of the production of *e* ; the place of articulation is the palate only. Similarly the lips (are) the place of articulation of *o* ; only the breath strikes at the velum. Others regard that (i. e. the velum) also as the place of articulation. The auditory difference is due to the difference between the tip, the centre and the root of the tongue, as in the case of *c, y* and *ś*. " But, are not (half *e* and *o* more homogenious to *e, o* ? " It is like this : If he had spoken of really existing homogeneity of these two, these two would alone be more homogeneous. " But those two do not exist ". If they had existed, they themselves would have been read, (preferably) for the sake of brevity. (Objection :) But the reading (of two-mora *e, o*) may be for the sake of the names Guṇa and Vṛddhi ? (Reply : No). The utterance of long (*e* and *o*) could be done when teaching (those) name(s). And that is why it has been necessary to make *t* suffixion and to read (the word) *varṇa* in *sahivahor od avarṇasya* (P. 6. 3. 112). " But, sir, the Sātyamugris and the Rāṇāyanīyas of the Sāman chanters ". Why the mention of *chandoga-* ' sāman-chanter ' ?

Because the Sātyamugris etc. are not wellknown. " *Sujāte aśvasūnṛte* ". They lay down the phoneme *ĕ* as the substitute (of *a*) when, within the same foot, it is not followed by *v* or *y*. This act of the revered ones belongs to a (particular) school (of Veda singers). They have such practices, peculiar to every branch (of the Veda). (Objection :) But indication (of the language) of an individual school *is* done, as e. g. *devasumnayor yajuṣi Kāṭhake* (P. 7. 4. 38). (Reply :) True. It is so. This is what is meant by *pārṣadakṛti* : Their utterance belongs to the school, and this school-usage (holds good in) its own place, not elsewhere. Many are their practices like this, ... *stobha* etc. For this reason it is said ' of the *sāman*-chanters '.

[3. 1]

" Because of closeness, in the place of three-mora and four-mora ". Because of absence of another (available substitute), this (excuse), too, is not (available) here : ' Pluta is desired in its domain ' (P. 6. 1. 87, *Śloka-Vār.*). " Here, as far as *paśum* is concerned, (the goal, viz. a long substitute) would have been achieved by (saying) *amy ekaḥ* ' a single substitute, when *am* follows ' (if that had been the goal) ". Or, even this need not be done. The long (substitute is) already achieved (by the rule) : *prathamyoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 102). True, it is so. But when (the rule) *ami* is framed, it can, by the mere fact of its framing, continue into (the rule) *vā chandasi* (P. 6. 1. 106) — may be *amy ekaḥ* is for it (the facility of continuation). Therefore reading of *pūrva* is for the sake of *pūrvarūpa* ' the form of the preceding '. But does not the earlier word *pūrva-* continue ? True. Still the word *dīrgha* also continues. There the continuation of *pūrva-* could be for this (different purpose) viz. that the preceding long (vowel) should remain (as the substitute); but (the substitute) should not be nearmost to both. This too has to be made to continue, viz. a second word *pūrva* from *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇaḥ*. " Or the procedure of the teacher indicates ". (Objection :) But it (P. 6. 4. 2) could be for restriction, so that (the lengthening) should not be there in *uta*. — This, then, is an indication, viz. *sau ca* (P. 6. 4. 13) and *saṁprasāraṇasya* (P. 6. 3. 139). — This, too, could be for negating the shortening (taught by) *iko hrasvo'ṅyo* ... (P. 6. 3. 61). Just of that is this sign, viz. that the two *pūrva* words continue (from previous rules) in the matter of the *pūrvarūpa* after *saṁprasāraṇa*. " (The desired goal is) achieved (by reading simply) *paraḥ* ' the following ' in connection with (the rule) *ato guṇe* (P. 6. 1. 97) ". There *e* and *o* are already long, what is (then) the use of reading *rūpa-* ? — It is understood for the sake of *a* only.

" Here, then, *khaṭvarśya* ". This is the idea : When, by virtue of (the rule) *ād guṇaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 87), all (Guṇa vowels, viz. *a*, *e* and *o*) have presented themselves, the phonemes *e* and *o* become fixed in (cases like) *khaṭvendraḥ* and

khaṭvoḍhā .... Therefore it will be heard uncoalesced. As it is said : 'Even the phonemes *jh* and *bh* are not finals of an inflected word '.

" Guṇa and Vṛddhi have a *t*-suffixion ". Even though the named (phonemes) are different (from the names), still, when mentioned in the form of the names, they are mentioned with their (i. e. of the names) gender and name, as e. g. *tarap-tamapau ghaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 22). Or, *tapare* means *taparasahite śāstre* 'the two rules containing *t*- suffixion '. Or, *tapare* is locative. (The meaning is :) the names Guṇa and Vṛddhi have a subject matter qualified by *t*-suffixion, (i. e.) they have their names with *t*-suffixion. — But whose *t*-suffixion is spoken of here ? — Of the named (phonemes). — Whence ? — Because a name is meant for something else (viz. the named). Such being the case, the *t*-suffixion of the name is (only) a means. Therefore, a mark, though affixed to a name, is understood as belonging to the named. — If so, there can be no ascertainment of the duration of the named, because of absence of their utterance. In these circumstances, when it is not known which time-duration is restricted by the *t*-suffixion, there may not be an understanding of the homogeneous (speech-sounds) because of the force of *t*-suffixion; but certainly this is not there, viz. that (there will be an understanding) of the two-mora (vowels) (only), and not of three-mora ones. If you think that the name itself has the *t*-suffixion, even then the phoneme *e* which has *t*-suffixion, and likewise the phoneme *ai* will convey a homogeneous (vowel) of the same duration, but (they will not convey) *o* and *au* (in addition). Therefore, either there will be no comprehension at all, or (vowels) of all duration will be understood. — There will be no harm if *t*-suffixion (is understood as) belonging to the name. For where *et* and *ait* are not composite wholes, the Pari. deficient in a limb in the form of the final phoneme does not present itself. Such being the case, (the rule) *taparas tatkālasya* (P. 1. 1. 70) busies itself just in this (respect), viz. 'of that (vowel) of the same duration as is comprehended '. And that comprehension (follows) from *t*-suffixion. Then, just as, after *i* and *u* are comprehended on the authority of the rules *ādir antyena sahetā* (P. 1. 1. 71) and *tanmadhyasya ca* (P. 1. 1. 71, *Vār.* 2) from (*pratyāhāra* names like) *aṇ* or aṭ by means of the initial phoneme *a* the phonemes *i* etc. cause the comprehension (of *ī* etc.), although they themselves are not heard. (Similarly also *o* and *u*.) Even when the view that it is the named which are furnished with *t*-suffixion (is accepted), that, which is included, is understood by (the rule) *ādir antyena sahetā* and subsequently it comprehends those which are of the same duration. And since it is near the two two-mora vowels, the understanding of it (a two-mora vowel) also is reasonable.

" What follows a *t* is also *tapara* ". The availability of these two is through *ekaśeṣa*, where (meaning), the cause of the currency (of a word) is not

taken into consideration (and consequently) the own form (of the word) is alone resorted to.

(Here) two rules (have to be understood as) rolled into one by the device of *tantra* on the strength of *sahivahor od avarṇasya* (P. 6. 3. 112), just as *ig yaṇaḥ saṁprasāraṇam* (P. 1. 1. 45) (is so understood) on the strength of the mention (of the word *saṁprasāraṇa*) with (different) specific case-ending. Or (the twofold interpretation can be justified) by the simultaneous expression of two meanings by one and the same word. "What is the purpose of the phoneme *t*?" All (the verbal roots) ending in *r̄* are *udātta* and non-nasal, so *t*-suffixion cannot reasonably be said to be conducive (to inclusion); nor can it be a warder-off, because of the absence of *aṇ* status (for *r̄*). So the phoneme *t* is just like *d*.

[4]

"These parts of phonemes, having forms similar to other phonemes." In diphthongs (there are) the parts, the speech-sounds *a*, *i* and *u* which have the same forms as other phonemes; similarly in *ā* etc. there are parts having the duration of a mora only; similarliy *r* in *ṛ*, and *l* in *ḷ*. Are they included in injunctions concerning *ak* etc? (He) states the reason for the comprehension of its part and (the reason for its) non-comprehension (thus): "Here (in the Akṣaras.) wholes are read, and also (their) parts. On the other hand, a part is included in the whole. It is like this: A tree, when moving, moves along with its parts (branches)." Here, in the Bhāṣya, the prior is stated as the reason for comprehension; the latter the reason for non-comprehension. The comprehension (of a speech-sound in the Pratyāhāra is) the reason for its comprehension (in an injunction), the non-comprehension (the reason for) the non-comprehension. In the case of (injunctions) like *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101) the parts are comprehended. Why? Because of their comprehension here (in the Pratyāhāra). "Here" (i. e.) in the Pratyāhāra "on the one hand wholes are uttered" like *e-o-ṅ*, *ai-au-c*; "on the other hand, parts also", as *a i uṇ*. And where the utterance is meant to be in the capacity of parts, there a whole, even though present, is not intended to be uttered. For example, *a i uṇ* is not (regarded as) a whole. Similarly *aṇ* or *aṭ*. What, then? Individuals only, as in the case of *hayavaraṭ*. Here, because of the utterance of *a*, ... impossible to utter ... not an utterance of *a*, and so in (the case of speech sounds) *val* etc., consonants without vowels (which follow them) are (meant to be) expressed. Similarly, in the case of expressions like *eṅ* or *aic* formed according to (the rule) *ādir antyena sahetā* (P. 1. 1. 71), the whole alone is uttered, not (its) parts like *a*, as their own place of utterance is elsewhere. Here, in *eco 'yavāyāvaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 78), the parts, although not uttered, receive the substitute taught for

the wholes through inference. For, they are not expressible by word. What (i. e. who) then? The wholes. For example, the word *vṛkṣa* 'tree' does not express fruit etc. Such being the case, the question arises: Where an operation for the whole presents itself, and also an operation for the part, which (of the two) is to take place? — The operation for the part. — Why? — Because the part is directly mentioned in that connection. Whereas in the case of an operation for the whole the part is subordinated by it and so it withdraws out of regard for the whole. (For instance:) *agna ā yāhi*. Just as (when it is said) 'Let ghee be given to this one', the receptacle, though received into the hand, is not included in the act of giving. Although given, it is not given; although accepted, it is not accepted. Similarly, a part, though included (in the whole), is not included. So, in *agna indra* it does not undergo an operation taught for the whole, which is (only) inferred (in its case); it undergoes (the operation) directly taught (for it) (viz.) the lengthening of an *ak* phoneme when a homogeneous (phoneme) follows. There are everywhere phonemes included in the wholes like *arka*, *aśva* etc. — which undergo operations enjoined for *ak*, because they are comprehended (by the Pratyāhāra *ak*). Just as (parts), when they are in wholes like a *pada*, everywhere undergo an operation, similarly also when they are in composite phonemes. Hence, because of (their) comprehension in the Pratyāhāra, their comprehension in the regions of operation.

Now the reason for non-comprehension is stated. "A part, on the other hand, is included in the whole". As regards what you think (viz.) that the wholes alone are uttered when the Akṣaras are uttered, how is that (to be understood)? It is questionable, even on the view that there is an utterance of the whole. Is it that a part, for that matter, is not resorted to at all? Or (is it) that a whole cannot be formed otherwise (i. e. without resorting to parts) but the activity of the teacher refers to the (part) when it is in the whole only? Or (the activity proceeds) by including (the parts) in (or subordinating them to) the wholes? We say that it is included. Such being the case, just as (a part) receives a substitution, similarly the designation *ec* also; in the matter of operations, however, the principal designation alone (applies). Just as, in the case of *praṣṭhī* 'a leader's wife', contact with activity is secondary, the acquisition of designation is principal, similarly this activity of the parts, viz. the acquisition of the designation; the parts acquire this activity also. This (is what) he says: A part proceeds, losing its independence; just as one belonging to man-lion species (is) similar to human species, still form sanother whole altogether. Such being the case (when it is said): 'Let the flesh of a lion be brought' or '(let) the flesh of a man (be brought)' his (i. e. Man-lion's) flesh is not brought. Therefore, how can parts which do not exist in the wholes be mentioned or how (can they be) understood?

Another alternative is taken up: 'When it is said that parts are one thing and the whole another and that both are uttered, it is on the view that there is a distinction between the whole and its constituents (and so the question is asked:) Such being the case, the part which is there in the diphthongs, why will it not receive the operation? (The reply is:) "A part is included in the whole". There is a unity between the whole and its constituents. It is not that a whole is one thing and the parts another. When they are situated in a particular way they get the designation ('diphthong'), just like this very movement which belongs to the parts.

Or by "Here the wholes are taught, and also the parts" (their) belonging to one and the same object is referred to. In this utterance *e-o-ṅ* or *ai-au-c*, both are uttered. 'In that capacity' is the remainder (of the sentence). It is like the *gargādi-bidādi* list which is meant to be (both) for the understanding of the whole as correct, and also for the removal of the defect like *kala* in the parts. "A part, on the other hand, is included in the whole" (means that) the utterance is for the whole only, not for the parts, just like the *gargādibidādi* list in the *prima facie* view.

[4. 1]

"Prohibition of operation (taught) for a *samāna* vowel (*Vārttika* 6)". ("For example, in) *agne indra*". Two operations, one based on the whole and another on the part, present themselves. There is scope for the *ay* substitute in *agna ā yāhi*, that for the lengthening in *dadhīndra*. Here, in *agne indra* the lengthening becomes due because of the conflict of equally powerful rules. Or, the *ay* substitute is inferential, while the lengthening (is) (taught) directly; and what is taught directly is stronger. — How about the *yaṇ* substitute? There also the part is mentioned directly? — True. It is so. There (the *yaṇ*) is superseded (by the lengthening) on account of (the dictum) 'A rule which is framed when some other rule (incompatible with it) is necessarily present, supersedes it', or by 'Exceptions (placed) in between supersede the preceding (general) rules, not the following ones".

[4. 1. 1]

"Since he teaches *tuk* after a long (vowel)". The *tuk* takes place before *ch* which follows a long (vowel). Whose (part is *tuk*)? '(An operation) belongs to what precedes when it is taught with something mentioned in Locative' (P. 1. 1. 66). — But it may be for *ai* or *au*. For, there the later portion is greater. ... The breaking into (two) rules is a sign that *tuk* does not come in.

[4. 1. 2]

"(*Tuk*) will not come in on account of the force of *t*-suffixion". For, here, the application (of the rule) is accomplished in *vṛkṣaiḥ* (etc.). The non-application, however, is not accomplished. And the sign of non-application is the *t*-suffixion. This being so the direct injunction is superseded by the inferential injunction viz. 'there is no (substitution of *ais*) after a long (vowel)'.

[4. 1. 3]

"In that (he affixes *k* as a code-letter) in (the rule) *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (P. 3. 2. 3)". Here also the withdrawal of *ā* is stated since (otherwise) the affixion of the code-letter will be meaningless. Here an objection is raised : If affixion of the code-letter *k* is not done, there (will be) a defect with reference to *mīnātiminotidīṅāṁ lyapi ca* (P. 6. 1. 50). If this (*ka*) of *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (P. 3. 2. 3) is taught as *a*, then, when *ā* is substituted for (the root-final of) *mīnāti* etc. as this is to become *e*, there will be the defect when the suffix *a* follows, of non-availability of (the suffix) *aṇ* which leads to the augment *yuk* for the roots in *ā*. — This defect (is) not (there). So far as *dīṅ* is concerned, it is intransitive, and so it cannot have a grammatical object as an Upapada. When furnished with a preverb, it could be transitive. Even so, the suffix is taught when (the root is) without a preverb. Also in the case of *mīnāti* and *minoti*, *mā* is a common name for (all *mā* roots) in the matter of the *ā* substitute and also in that of the suffix *aṇ*. It is for this reason that it is said (in the *Mbh*) : "This may be for a subsequent (rule)."

"Well, then, *gāpoṣ ṭak* (P. 3. 2. 8)." Here also an objection is raised : In *chandogāya* elision (of *ā* of the root *gā*) will become due by the rule *āto dhātoḥ* (P. 6. 4. 140). Nor can the *pratipadokta* metarule be resorted to, since, then the form *papuṣaḥ* cannot be derived. If, on the other hand, the *saṁnipāta* metarule is resorted to, *ā* itself will not be there (in *chandogāya*). — Reply : (The *Vār.*) *āto 'nāpaḥ* is there. With it, the deletion of *ā* has to take place everywhere.

[4. 2]

"Also, like a single phoneme" (*Vār.* 8). (A later) number everywhere cancels (an earlier one). So the word *vāc* could be called dissyllabic. Such being the case, extension, viz. (the statement) 'like a single phoneme' is an alternative, with which the natural dissyllabicness would go. Where will (then) the rule *sāv ekācaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 168) be (applicable) ? — (In forms like) *srucā*, *tvacā*. Or, "The reading of *go* and *nau*". Here inference of a general nature, that is, of an universal nature, is assumed.

[4. 3]

" An operation (taught) for a part is not (effected) when it (the part) belongs to an integrated (whole) (*Vār*. 9). " A whole where separateness does not exist is (called) *avyapavṛkta* ' integrated '. An operation (taught) for a part is not effected when it (the part) belongs to an integrated (whole). Or, an operation which is laid down for an independent part is not effected in the case of a part of an integrated whole, which (the part) is not independent. " There are seventeen *sāmidhenī*-s ". The word (*sāmidhenī*) which originally means *ṛc*-s, also means, because of association, sticks of wood. And a stick of wood seventeen *aratnī*-s long is not said (to be) seventeen in number. For the number seventeen is based on separateness. (So) that (number) does not apply to what is qualified by the number one. Such being the case, just as the parts (of the wood stick) which are not separate are not recognised, so also the parts of a phoneme too. " For, that ritual is enjoined with reference to each single *ṛc* ". Such being the case, there will be a defect in the ritual if the burning is either more or less (than enjoined). If it is (argued) that let him place the whole (log of wood) and recite the *ṛc*-s, even then " impossibility in the fire and also on the altar ". For, an altar is three and a half hands (in length). " Well, then, just as ... ". (This) is introduced with the idea that here the word *samidh* ' a faggot ' is not (current) because of its connection with *ṛc*-s; also, because of its small size, there is a possibility (of placing the whole faggot on fire). " Here also, with reference to each *praṇava* ". Here also, (the argument is) as before. " Well, then, just as ghee, oil etc. ". This is (what is) said : It is not proper to decide because of mere possibility. Even though the possibility of ghee and oil is there, still the two are sold (in the form of cow and mustard) because the ghee-form is not expressed by the word ' cow ' and the oil-form by the word ' mustard '. For, if mere possibility (were considered), one who sells cows would also be called a seller of flesh. — But (then) the maxim ' Beans shall not be eaten ' is violated. For, one does not eat even mixed beans. Liquor is not to be drunk, so even mixed (liquor) is not drunk.

"Well, (what) then where separateness is seen ? " Sometimes separateness is seen in what is qualified by the number one. Where ? In apartments etc. Verily, it is said : ' This is (an apartment) having five bedsteads, this one having seven bedsteads '. Similarly, in diphthongs, separateness is visible owing to the cessation and commencing of the effort.

" In the diphthongs, (no comprehension) because of openness (*Vār*. 10) ". " More open ". This should be understood as ' most open '. There is no homogeneousness itself here on account of difference in effort; how can there be a comprehension (of the part by its independent counterpart) ?

[5]

" Or, again, they are not comprehended ". This non-comprehension stated by *nāvyapavṛktasya* etc., this applies to the phonemes *ā* etc. Even where separateness is there, (e. g.) in the diphthongs, there is no homogeneity. Therefore only the phonemes *ṛ* and *ḷ* now remain. In this respect, this is the view of the *Vākyakāra* : There are certainly no two parts. It is a (different) whole, belonging to a different class altogether, like a Man-Lion. With this view he proceeds —.

[5. 1]

" In the operation of *nuṭ*, in the substitution of *l*, and in the substitution of *ṇ* (*Vār*. 11) ". If there are parts in that whole, then, in the case of an operation (taught) for the whole, there will be no participation of the part in it, e. g. in the *ay*-substitution. Where, on the other hand, the part itself is concerned — not the whole — a part which is there will participate in the operation. Since in the case of *nuṭ* etc. the whole is not taught (as participating in the operation), *nuṭ* etc. depending on parts will take effect. (So) there is no need of mentioning the phoneme *ṛ*. — If so, in the case of *tuk* also, when a short (vowel) is resorted to, *tuk* will be there (undesiredly), (e. g.) in *ālūya, pralūya*. — That is already taken care of either by reason of the absence of clear separateness, or by the indication (mentioned in the *Mbh.* :) *dīrghāc che tukaṁ* śāsti, or by the making of two rules instead of one. " Only of *aśnoti* (among roots) having *a* as the penultimate ". Inference in this way is reasonable, not in this (other) way : (*aśnoti* is mentioned) so that (the *nuṭ* should be available) to *aśnoti* only, not to *aśnāti*.

" Wording without a case-ending ". With this wording, a wording *ur* (can be extracted). Since this will have no scope (otherwise) there will be *l*-substitution for *r* which is part (of *ṛ*). " Sphoṭa in general is mentioned ". Sphoṭa is soundless — this is what is said. — But surely there is no perception of Sphoṭa without sound ? — Well, then, it is the initial sound, that conveys the general form, only that much is intended (here). That one, however, which conveys a particular one — (e. g.) ' this is a part of a whole ', ' this is independent ' — that one is not intended. Even when a particular form is there, (there is also) a general form, as e. g. in the case of a cow there is a perception (of it) in a particular form or a perception in a general form. Therefore, there is an understanding of a general form of both (*r* and *l*). Or, this is said on the view that (word is) a product, as it were. On this view that word is a product, the Sphoṭa itself comes into being from a conjunction, disjunction, or from a conjunction-and-disjunction. As regards the trailing sound, that (results) from

word itself. Therefore, only that much activity of the speech organs is intended, which just produces that Sphoṭa. Or, by 'Sphoṭa in general' it is conveyed that this is a mention of a class. In this mention of a class one does not understand without (an individual) sound, so the individual (sound) which is inseparable has to be understood. When an individual is mentioned, the individual which is (thus) directly mentioned gets connected with the activity. This being the case the purpose of resorting to the class is the understanding of the two *r*-sounds, (one) included (in *ṛ*) and the other not (so) included.

"That which (is) after the phoneme *r*, (after) the *bhakti*". There is either coordination of this (*bhakti*) with *r*; so *bhakti* = the phoneme *r*; what is after. Or, (by *bhakti* is meant) *akārabhakti* or *ikārabhakti*; what is after it. "(The result) will be (achieved) by (the rule) *aṭ ... vyavāye ...*" (P. 8. 4. 2). (He) thinks thus: Just as the phoneme *a* comprehends, because of its *aṇ*-status, long and prolated (varieties of *a*), similarly it will comprehend *bhakti* also. Or (the comprehension will take place), on the view that a (whole) class is comprehended, since the class (or universal) is present everywhere. — True. There is such a view. (But) only such phonemes can be comprehended on this view as are (actually) included (in the Akṣaras.). This is what is said. (Comprehension is possible in the case) of (only) those who have an *aṭ*-status elsewhere. "Those phonemes which are also separate". ... This phoneme-fragment, however, is not seen anywhere else and also there is no homogeneousness. (To explain :) There is no effort of the parts apart from the effort of the whole, nor (a separate) place of articulation. Nor can this much portion of a phoneme manifest a class. "(Intervened) by these members of the Akṣarasamāmnāya only". Even phonemes like *ā*, (secondarily) conveyed, are to be understood as members of the *Akṣarasamāmnāya*. *Bhakti*, however, is neither the conveyor nor the conveyed. Hence the splitting of the rule.

[5. 2]

"(The rule) *plutāv aica uditau* '(when there is an extra lengthening) of *ai*, *au*, (their parts) *i* and *u* become *pluta*' (has to be framed)" (*Vār*. 12). For, separateness is here. (But) if noncomprehension (is subscribed to), then, in spite of separateness, this (rule) : *aica uditau plutau* has to be taught. But, on the other hand, if comprehension is there, then (the goal) is achieved by *guror anṛta(ḥ) ...* (P. 8. 2. 86) itself, since *ai* is heavy and the (word-bit) beginning with the final vowel (of *ai*; i. e. *i*) is technically called *ṭi*. In the case of *ā* etc., however, they are here absent, because of the absence of separation. "This is already done in the Sūtrapāṭha". This (is what) he points to: Although (the parts) may be comprehended, still this (goal) is not achieved. For, it is said : 'Because of the openness in diphthongs'. Such being the case, even if equal

division is there, there will be no *ac*-status (for *i/u* of *ai/au*) itself on account of the absence of their comprehension (by the independent *i/u*) owing to difference in the manner of articulation; what to say of the Pluta? And even if (it be pleaded that) the later (part) is larger, still (a speech sound) one and a half mora long has no *ac*-status. Nor has that half mora any separateness. Therefore, it is proper to stick to the text as it is.

[5. 3]

" In a conjunct consonant having a similar form, the operation (taught) for two consonants (*Vār*. 13) ". A conjunct consonant is called 'having a similar form' because its parts have similar forms. Certainly, a conjunct consonant being one, it cannot have a similar form. (This is) what is meant: just as in *ā* etc. there is no clear separateness, and so there is no designation for the part, similarly, here also absence of clear separateness is common. Since the mention is in the form of the class, the difference made by smallness or greatness is not intended and so the whole is (only) one consonant. Therefore the designation *saṁyoga* 'a cluster of consonants' is not available. The point is that when, in this way, the designation *saṁyoga* is not there, the Pluta taught by (the rule) *guror anṛta(ḥ)*... (P. 8. 2. 86) will not be there. " Here the duration of a mora is experienced, and there is no consonant having the length of one mora ". Here *a* etc. are known from the list. That *ā* etc. also are there (is known) from a *sāmānyato-dṛṣṭānumāna* viz. ' there is a class of long *ak* vowels, just as the diphthongs (are long) '. For these (latter) are read with two moras. A Pluta, in addition, is mentioned (in the rule) *ūkālo'j jhrasvadīrghaplutaḥ* (P. 1. 2. 27). Its comprehension is there by (the rule) *aṇ udit savarṇasya* (P. 1. 1. 69). Such being the case, we understand that these, being accepted by men of learning and culture, have been taught (in grammar) by reading them (in the *Akṣaras*.) and by laying them down. In the case of (double) consonants, however, they are neither read, nor are they comprehended (by any sound in the *Akṣaras*.), nor are they laid down anywhere. Thus, when they are not uttered by men of learning and culture, how can they be named? And the seed of this (attitude) is this: In the case (of vocalic phonemes) like *ā* etc., a sound produced by speech organs, directed with a single effort, — when it produces another sound, it shows the difference in duration even before the activity of speech organs ceases; but that is not so with the consonants. Here there is unanimity among the men of learning and culture that when one consonant is uttered, it is with a different effort that the speech organs engage in (uttering) another consonant. This is the difference: Here (i. e. in the case of double consonants) (the speaker) utteres repeatedly. Such being the case, just as (the speaker), when he wants to utter *a* repeatedly sets the speech organs into activity

again and again, similarly in the case of consonants also. "But how here — *saỹyantā saṽvatsaraḥ taḻlokam yaḻlokam* ?" In the earlier case (you) decided on the non-existence (of *kk* etc.) because of non-apprehension. But the semivowels are read in the *aṇ* sounds. They will comprehend the whole, since these (semivowels) are taught by grammar just like *ā*. "Here, too the duration of a mora is experienced". There is this additional thing also; one (is) nasal and another non-nasal. Here it is difficult to maintain that (one and the same sound) will be both nasal and non-nasal. Therefore, restraining the speech organs, the utterance of the second sound (is brought about) with another effort and so there is no consonant having the duration of one mora. How can something non-existent be comprehended? For only (a speech sound) that exists can be comprehended by a homogeneous (speech sound). A phoneme *a*, having the duration of one mora cannot, verily, comprehend *a* having a half mora. Why? Because it does not exist.

ha ya va raṭ / 5

I

[1]

"This phoneme *h* is uttered twice, the earlier one, and the subsequent one". The being earlier or the subsequent is not in relation to other phonemes. For if it were in relation to other phonemes, all others, execept *a*, would be both earlier and subsequent.

[1. 1]

"(In the rules) mentioning *aṭ*, mention of *h* (will be necesary)" (*Vār.* 1). The mention of one (rule reading) *aṭ* is made without any purpose here, viz. *śaś cho 'ṭi* (P. 8. 4. 63). (Rule) reading *aṭ* is mentioned here as purposive by the Vākyakāra. For, in *mahā̆ hi saḥ*, there will be no *ru*- substitution (for *n*) by *āto 'ṭi* ... (P. 8. 3. 3) owing to the absense of *aṭ*- status for *h*.

[1. 2]

But even (a rule) mentioning *aś*, viz. *bhobhago* ... (P. 8. 3. 17), will necessitate (an additional rule reading *h*). For here in *bho hasati* 'O, (he) laughs', there will be no *y*-substitution, caused by a following *aś*, owing to the absence of *aś*- status (for *h*). This is meant for mentioning the purposes in their totality. So *utve ca hakāragrahaṇam* should be read.

[1. 3]

"If elsewhere also an utterance (is necessary)". This is (what is) shown: The reading of phonemes here is not for an understanding of their form,

(For) what, then ? For the functioning of grammar. And grammar, as long as *h* is not uttered (twice), is not well established.

II

[1]

" This *r* ". There are merits and defects in both, hence the question.

[1. 1]

In " *svar nayati* ", the nasal *ṇ* becomes due. For, in this rule, the word *savarṇa* ' homogeneous ' is not read. In " *madrahrada* ", two *r* sounds will be heard, because after *r* is reduplicated, there will be no deletion (of the first *r*) by *ro ri* (P. 8. 3. 14), as the reduplication is technically non-existent. In " *kuṇḍaṁ rathena* ", a non-nasal *r* becomes due as a homogeneous with the following, as it is not specifically said that the homogeneous with the following must be a nasal. (This) homogeneous with the following is technically non-existent and so the deleting (of the preceding *r*) by *ro ri* (P. 8. 3. 14) does not take place.

[2]

" If (*r*) is read earlier, (then) prohibition of *kit*-status (becomes necessary) (*Vār*. 5) " because, if (*r*) is read earlier, *v* also is (technically designated) *ral*. " Also a statement of deletion of *v* and *y* (*Vār*. 5) ", because *r* will not be included in *val*. The statement *vyalopavacanam* (" If [*r*] is read earlier " ... etc.) is rejected in the context of *v*, not in the context of *y*.

[2. 1]

" There are no homogeneous (phonemes) of *r* and the spirants. " (Objection :) But it was said that *r* and *ṇ* will become due for the (very) reason that in one case the homogeneousness while in the other a nasal is not required. (Reply :) True. It is so. But this (disputant) provides remedy for these two also when he will suggest the solution for reduplication.

" These (two), *r* and *h*, are not the undergoers (of the operation) of reduplication. — What then (are they) ? — These (two), *r* and *h*, are the cause of reduplication ". In this sentence, viz, in (the rule, P. 8. 4. 46 :) *aco rahābhyām* ... , the phonemes *r* and *h*, which are resorted to as the cause, cannot aspire, on the strength of this sentence, to be the undergoers of the operation. Why ? Because in this sentence, *r* and *h* are only inferred (as *kāryin-s*) on the strength of the reading *yaraḥ*, while they are directly mentioned as the cause by the expression *rahābhyām*. " It is like this : ' Let the Brāhmaṇas be fed and let Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya serve food ' ". In this context the act of eating on

the part of the two, inferred on the strength of the sentence, is superseded by the act of serving food which is directly ordered; so the two do not experience agent-hood of the action of eating.

If so, there will be a drawback in (the Saṁdhi) *dadhyudaka*. In the case of the rule *iko yaṇ aci* (P. 6. 1. 77) the *ik* sounds are inferred to be the cause (of the *yaṇ*- substitution) because of (the word) *ac*; they are directly mentioned as undergoing (that) operation, and so their status of cause has to be superseded by the status of undergoer in the operation. Further, if it is argued (by the opponent) that one and the same (entity) may not undergo an operation because of its status as the cause, whereas in this case there are two different entities expressed by *ikaḥ* and *aci*, (we point out that) here also in *madrahrada*, the phoneme *h* which is the cause is quite different (from *r*). Then why does not *r*, which follows *h*, undergo reduplication ?

There is no drawback because of (two) different sets of principles (followed in the two cases). It is on the set of principles : ' a class constitutes an entity ', ' a rule proceeds (only) once ', ' a rule applies to the group (as a whole) ' and ' grammar (is) subservient to knowledge ', that it is said : ' There are no homogeneous (phonemes) of *r* and the spirants ', ' These two, *r* and *h* are not the undergoers (of the operation) of reduplication '. If it is asked, how about the rule : *yaro 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vā* (P. 8. 4. 45), (the reply is :) grammar is independent of linguistic usage. There is no nasal substitute for *r* and the spirants in actual usage. (And) a grammatical rule does not proceed again, from which (the necessary) understanding would have followed. As it is said : ' There are no final *jh* and *bh* ' (*Mbh*. I. 36. 1–2), so that (the augments) *jhuṭ* and *bhuṭ* will not materialize. Similarly, the rule *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ* (P. 8. 4. 58) proceeds, having first ascertained the whole Anusvāra complex (on the one hand) and the whole *paras ıvarṇa* complex (on the other). Such being the case, because of (the ıule, P. 1. 1. 50) *sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ*, there is maximum closeness with the (other) complex based on nasality. Indeed, it happens that a group (is said) to possess what (actually) only some members of it possess, e. g. *gomad idaṁ nagaram* ' this town (is) possessed of cows ', ' the staff bearers (monks) are going '. Similarly, at the time of understanding (the rule) (it is understood that) the (phoneme) homogeneous with the following has to be close to the utmost. (In practice, however) *r* is not of that kind and so is not qualified. The activity of a grammatical rule is only once, so *r* is not nasal. Similarly the rule (P. 8. 4. 46) *aco rahābhyām* ... is also independent of linguistic usage. Is there a close contiguity of *r* and *h* in one and the same (syllable) ? No. (The rule) proceeds (to convey) this much that a *yar* phoneme following *r* or *h* is reduplicated. Such being the case, just as *h*

is excluded, so also *r*. Since, after this much is understood there is no re-application (of the rule), by which application will *r* following *h* (in *madrahrada*) undergo reduplication ?

In *dadhyudaka* etc. on the other hand, an understanding takes place on the view that 'the individual (constitutes) on entity', 'grammar (is) subservient to usage', 'a rule proceeds more than once', (and) 'the rules are multiplied according to the target (the grammatical constituent), but are not uttered (every time) owing to laxity'. Hence also it is that in the case of (the rule, P. 1. 1. 44) *na veti vibhāṣā* there is acceptance of it on one view and rejection on another view. A rule of grammar proceeds towards (its) target(s) simultaneously ... The establishement (of the correct form) *madrahrada* etc. is made known by it itself. When there is activity (of the rule) towards every target, there is a straightforward establishment of rules in *dadhyudaka* etc. ... Therefore, [this prohibition] need not be stated.

III

[1]

"These Ayogavāhas are not uttered anywhere" — they are not read in the Pratyāhāra (albhabet) unlike others — "at the same time they are heard" — in the usage, and also in grammar at the time of their teaching, e. g. *kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ* (P. 8. 3. 15), *kupvoḥ ka-pau ca* (37). "They should be uttered (in the alphabet) for the purpose of operations," because their correctness may be (guaranteed) on account of their teaching, still, an operation (which may be) based on a (particular) Pratyāhāra will not be possible. "Which, to start with, are the Ayogavāhas ?" This is a technical name (coined) by older teachers. This is a large army (of syllables); apparently it must be significant. With this idea he asks : "But why (are they so called) ?" "Since they carry without being yoked, and are heard without being uttered (in the alphabet)". Here some phonemes carry, i. e. undergo an operation, being yoked by (i. e. connected with) a grammatical rule or by generality, e. g. the phonemes like *ā*. These, verily, carry out (an operation) being connected (with the *pratyāhāra*) either by (the rule) *aṇ udit savarṇasya...* (P. 1. 1. 69) or by their possession of the generality *a*-ness. Others, on the other hand, are heard, being uttered (in the alphabet), as for example *a* etc. (But) these (Ayogavāhas) are thus connected neither by a grammatical rule, nor by generality, nor are they uttered (in the alphabet). Well, what is the activity of the absence of being uttered in the name Ayogavāha ? This is the idea : connection is of two kinds, connction as by a rule of grammar and connection by utterance (in the alphabet). (Connection) of both kinds is not there in their case. Others explain : "Since

they 'carry' without being 'yoked', and are heard without being uttered (in the alphabet)" differently. They take "are heard without being uttered (in the alphabet)" as a paraphrase of "they 'carry' without being 'yoked'". Utterance in grammar is either by a rule or by reading. And that is not there in their case.

[2]

[(The Ayogavāhas should be read) among the *śar*-s (sibilants) for *jaś*-substitution and cerebralization of *s* (*Vār*. 7)]. *Jaś*-substitution is taught (for the Ayogavāhas) out of consideration of their *jhal* status in the *śar* position. So, *jaś*-substitution is established by uttering (the Ayogavāhas) here (i. e. among *śar*-s) also. "(Reduplication) of the (word-bit) beginning with the Upadhmānīya (becomes due)". Whether (*jaś*-substitution is effected first) on the view that *pūrvatrāsiddham* does not apply to reduplication, or whether reduplication (is effected) first, on both alternatives an undesired form (results). "(This is) achieved just by the ready-made form mentioned". — What happens to the reduplication? — Here this is the (hidden) idea: Mention of a ready-made word is a sign. Such being the case, we do not understand that the *bh*-substitution takes place by this (Nipātana). Then by which (rule)? (There is a *Vār*.) *hṛgrahor bhaś chandasi hasya* (on P. 8. 2. 32) (which teaches $h > bh$). Here (an unsaid) remnant of the statement will be inferred: *udjeś ca dakārasya* 'also in the place of *d* of *udj*'. But this does not mean that this mention of the ready-made word itself brings about this. "That mention of the ready-made word belongs to a domain other than the *ku* (velar) substitution". An inference restricted to a specific domain can be had. "This (suffix) *ḍa* is (laid down) after the root *gam*- preceded by two preverbs". Even though now the mention of the ready-made word itself is the teaching authority, still on the force of the reading of *d*, the Nipātqna will wait for the reduplication (to take place first).

[3]

"*Num* has to be mentioned of necessity". In this context *num* has to be replaced by Anusvāra. Such being the case, the reading of *num* is just for this purpose, viz. that the (cerebralization of *s*) will take place only where an Anusvāra (arisen out of *num* is there). If (the rule is) *śarvyavāye* 'when there is an intervention by *śar*', (cerebralization of *s*) becomes due when there is any Anusvāra (intervening), e. g. in *puṁsu*. Therefore the reading of *num* (in the rule) stands.

[4]

"Or, the utterance (of Ayogavāha in the Akṣaras.) should be made unspecifically". By this it is not meant that it should be done in (groups) other

than the *aṭ*-s and the *śar*-s also. What then ? It is the specificness of purpose that is (thus) referred to. ' *Ṇ*-substitution (is) the purpose ', ' *jaś*-substitution and *ṣ*-substitution are the purpose ' — this should not be said. If they are uttered among the *aṭ*-s and also among the *śar*-s, all the purposes which do not require any special (Śiva-Sū.) are achieved. The *hal* status (consonantal status) (follows) from utterance among the *śar*-s, from that the nomenclature *saṁyoga* ... and *al*-status (from utterance) among the *aṭ*-s.

[5]

" The substitutes become (replacers) of the (word-element) actually mentioned (in the rule) ", as, e. g. in *vaiyāghrapadya*.

[6]

(An illustration of) reduplication : *uraḥkeṇa*. This is said on the view that there is a difference in the auditory perceptions.

[7]

" *Vyūḍhoraskena* ". The generality viz. *al*-ness is there in the particular viz. *aṭ*. The Visarjanīya could he (called) *aṭ* by reason of utterance (in the alphabet). *Ṇ*-substitution is the domain of *al*; therefore the extension of the status of the original will not be there.

IV

[1]

" Now, are these phonemes meaningful ? " — A question (is possible) when a reason and a purpose (for it) are there. Such being the case, what is the reason or the purpose for this (question) ?— This is the reply : Here something is perceived by direct perception. Something, not (so) perceived, is ascertained as existing by inference. Something, believed to be perceived directly, is known to be not existing by inference. Well, in the case of wholes (of phonemes) like *v-ṛ-k-ṣ-a*, no meaning of phonemes is perceived directly. Here the existence (of the meaning of phonemes) is established on the basis of inference, like (that of) the unperceived movement of the sun on the strength of his reaching a different region; or, as in the case of a firebrand wheel where, although it is believed to be perceived directly, (the ascertainment of the non-existence of the wheel) is made on the strength of inference, inasmuch as the (wheel-)form is (elsewhere) seen even when (the wheel) is motionless. It is like this : A chariot wheel, even when it has ceased to move, is the cause of the cognition of a wheel; not so a firebrand wheel. Therefore it is an illusion, this apparent perception of a pervading form. Because in a (chariot) wheel, the form is never devoid of touch : just as there is a continuity of experience of form, there is a continuity of experience of touch also.

Not so in the case of a firebrand wheel. For, experience of touch (is there) for a particular region only. Everywhere in grammar meaningfulness is inferential. In the case of verbal roots etc. (it is established) by invariable presence and absence. Meaning can be assumed for phonemes also on the basis of the meaningfulness of the whole.

And (this is) the purpose : when a word-element is meaningful, (there is) the name *prātipadika* for it and, based on it is the coming into being of (the case-endings) *-su* etc. If, however, the meaningfulness of phonemes is (purely) inferential, based on the meaning of the whole, then that meaningfulness will be consisting of meanings unconnected (with the meaning of the whole), as in the case of the ingredients of liquor. Or, so that (the meaningfulness of phonemes consists) of meanings connected with the whole, the meanings of the parts are so apportioned (as look) connected with the whole : (e. g.) a verbal root expresses action, an affix a means. Similarly (it is explained that) a whole denotes a substance, but the phonemes (denote) parts like the class etc. Or (it is explained that) just as the inflected words, expectant (of each other), express one and the same meaning, similarly phonemes also may express one and the same meaning in expectation of each other.

[2. 1]

" Because meaning is seen (in the case of roots etc.) consisting of a single phoneme " (*Vār*. 9). Verily, meaning is seen through invariable presence and absence. — Is sight, then, the reason ? If sight, then, the meaningfulness becomes due in the case of only those (phonemes), where it is seen; not in the case of others. Therefore the oneness and the phonemeness (form) the reason. Here, meaningfulness is seen to go with the oneness and the phonemeness of roots etc. These (phonemes in *vṛkṣa* etc.) too are accompanied by oneness and phonemeness. Therefore, they too must be accompanied by meaningfulness. This, for that matter, is a property of a phoneme. His idea is this : Here an object, which is not capable of some property, is absolutely incapable. It is like this : An atom, not capable of perception, is incapable everywhere. Therefore, a phoneme is capable of the property which is being discussed. Only that (meaningfulness of a phoneme), by itself and not expecting (another one), is seen only some times.

[2. 2]

" And because of the understanding of a change in the meaning, when there is a change of phonemes " (*Vār*. 10). Just as there is (the word) *rājavyatyaya* ' change of king ', when one goes and another comes, similarly here (in grammar) (the word) *varṇavyatyaya* is accepted when one phoneme goes [and

another comes]. Here (in speech), owing to coming and going of meaningful (speech units), understanding of a change in meaning is seen. For example, in *pratiloma* 'unfavourable' and *anuloma* 'favourable', while the word-element *-loma* is fixed, there is an understanding of different meanings, viz. 'unfavourableness' and 'favourableness' on account of the coming and the going of the meaningful *anu* and *prati*. Similarly, here also while word-element *ūpa* is fixed, there is an understanding of different meanings when there is a coming and going of the phonemes *k* and *s*. Therefore there is meaningfulness of these two.

Some read : "The meaning *kūpa* 'well', which is there in (the word) *kūpa*, that belongs to the phoneme *k*.". They explain thus : Although (the meaning belongs to *k*) as expecting (the other element *ūpa*), still it *is* (its). The text of others (is) : *sakakārasya* 'belonging to (the word) as accompanied by the phoneme *k*'. They say thus : The meaningfulness (belongs to the whole) when accompanied by the phoneme *k*. Just as (it belongs to the wholes *pratikūla* and *anukūla*) as accompanied by the words *prati* and *anu*.

[2. 3]

" Also, because there is no understanding of meaning when there is no perception of a phoneme " (*Vār*. 11). Here (in speech) when there is no perception of a meaningful (speech unit), that meaning is not understood. For example : *pibati* 'drinks' : *vipibati* 'drinks after separating'. Here *vi-* has the meaning of making separate. *Vipibati* (means) makes separate (and drinks). When the word *vi-* is not perceived, separation is not understood from *pibati*. Similarly *pratiṣṭhate* 'starts' and *tiṣṭhati* 'stands'. Here in *ṛkṣa*, where *v* is not perceived, (the object 'tree' which is) a whole consisting of roots etc. is not understood. Here this is (what is) stated : All phonemes are possessed of powers of expressing all meanings. But in a particular, this or that, sequence of phonemes their some power remains dormant and some other comes to the surface.

Anarthagateḥ (in the *Vār.*) is a compound of syntactically and semantically unconnected (constituents), (which really means) *arthasyāgateḥ*. This (situation) has this difference from the preceding one (2. 2) : In the preceding one the going and the coming (of phonemes are seen); here it is the going only.

" Why is it then said *anarthagateḥ* 'because there is no understanding of meaning' ? " You indeed said " that meaning is not understood ". By saying this, you (practically) said 'but another meaning is understood'. Such being the case, why is it said 'because there is no understanding of meaning ?' " Not in a better-way... ". (This is) a popular idiom. It is like this. Somebody

says to someone : What is the use of him going ? He will not do (the job). Someone replies : ' Let this one alone go. (He) will do the job far better '. " *Tadarthaḥ* (means) *tasyārthaḥ* ' its meaning ' ". (So the whole expression means :) because there is no understanding of the meaning, belonging to that word mentioned before. If you think thus : What is it that is mentioned by *tasya* ' its ' ? Is it the whole or the phoneme ? (If phoneme) it is improper since this very thing is to be proved — he says (alternatively) : " *Tadarthaḥ* (means) *so'rthaḥ* ' that meaning ' ". The meaning which is mentioned before is resorted to as the meaning (in *atadarthagateḥ*). Just this (meaning) is not understood when the phoneme *v* is gone. " It is like this ... *uṣṭramukhaḥ* ' camel-faced ' ". Here, the camel itself cannot (obviously) be the face and so the word *iva* retires (?). And that whole-word (viz. *uṣṭra*) denotes not any other limb (of the camel) (but the face), so the word *mukha* also retires. And that whole-word (*uṣṭra*) (denotes ' face ') not when (a word expressive of) any limb follows, but only when *mukha* follows; this too has been specifically stated. Similarly here (i. e. in *anarthagateḥ*) also non-mention of *tad* for conveying the meaning mentioned is resorted to; on its strength it is understood that (the word *artha*) proceeds (to convey) that meaning only (*tatraiva*), (in other words) it proceeds, having taken up the meaning of the word *tad*.

[2. 4]

" And because of the meaningfulness of the whole " (*Vār*. 12). Seeing and not seeing is the reason. Just as there is some quantity of oil in a sesamum grain, similarly there is some quantity of meaning-conveyance in phonemes. When, however, there is an utterance of a number of phonemes the mind, (becoming) mature, understands the meaning.

[3]

" If these phonemes are meaningful, (operations) caused by meaningful (linguistic unit) become due ". This is (what is) said : There is no harm in linguistic usage, (even) if meaningfulness (of phonemes) be there. In grammar, however, some difficulty arises. Perhaps it may be thought : (mere) nomenclature does not lead to harm. Therefore he says that since a name is meant for some operation, there will be an appearance of (the case-endings) *-su* etc. Of course he does not raise the objection that there will be a hearing (of the case endings) *-su* etc. since the case-endings are to be deleted.

Objection : If (the word *samāsa* in P. 1. 2. 46) is meant for restricting (the name *prātipadika* to *samāsa*) in the case of groups of meaningful (speech-units), there will not be, inspite of the meaningfulness of sentence etc. the

designation *prātipadika* (for the group of phonemes itself). (Reply :) This defect (is) not (there). The name (*prātipadika*) (arises) simultaneously for the phonemes and the whole and so there is no existence of a group of case-inflected (words) (when the name becomes due). Their meaning is an unity. Or, (they) arise in a general way; restriction (is there) when they have arisen, and so there is the possibility of the case-endings. — As in the case of reduplication of a whole, case endings arise after the whole, not after the parts. -- True. It is so. The parts desire (separate status of *pada*). Such being the case, if you think that when a whole is reduplicated the parts also are (as good as) reduplicated, then similarly when a whole gets the designation of *pada* (there is) the *pada* designation for the parts also, and consequently *pada*- operations (also become due).

[4. 1]

" Because of the single-entity status of the whole, (there is) an absence of case-endings after a phoneme " (*Vār*. 13). Some say : Because of the singularity of the whole, when meaning thus belongs to phonemes, generality etc. are not made by singularity. On the view that the technical names and Paribhāṣās go into the region of the operation, (the case-endings called) *dvivacana* ' dual ' and *ekavacana* ' singular ' come after a nominal stem when two (objects) and one (object) are to be indicated (respectively); how can then a case-ending come after indeclinables which have no singularity ? (The reply is that) the statement of the deletion of feminine and case-endings is an indication of the appearance of case-endings (after them).

[4. 2]

Others say : Even on the view that phonemes are meaningful, when the mere object is presented, only this much is understood : A beginning has been made to speak of some object. The understanding of the number of that object (comes) from the whole only. Therefore ' singularity is the meaning of the whole '.

[4. 3]

(Still) some others say : This singularity of the phonemes and of the whole is identical. Such being the case, (only) if the case-ending coming after the whole is not [capable] of manifesting the singularity common to all, a case-ending will come (after phonemes). But since it is capable of it, [no case-ending comes after phonemes]. Just as many spectators, operating with just one lamp, do not avail themselves of another lamp.

[4. 4]

The revered one, however, says : " Singularity is the meaning of the whole ". (It is like this :) Just as a group of many mono-syllabics (is itself called) *ekāc* ' monosyllabic ' in company with phonemes themselves, and so also the parts (are called *ekāc*) in company with it (the whole) ; similarly, the parts also (become) meaningful with that with which, possessed of singularity the whole is meaningful. And a case-ending coming after a whole *is* able to embrace the parts on the strength of inference. Nor is ihe name Pada (applicable) to the parts. Whence ? Because the teaching of the name Pada depends on word only. The teaching of the name Pada depends on word because of the rule *suptiṅ* ... (P. 1. 4. 14). Just as in the case of the name *aṅga*....

(The enquiry) ' Are phonemes meaningful or meaningless ' — this is a Crow-teeth Enquiry. Whether they are meaningful or whether meaningless, there is no harm whatever.

[5. 1]

" (They are) rather meaningless, because of the absence of perception of meaning for every phoneme " (*Vār*. 14). Their meaningfulness is not known even on the strength of inference. Verily no constant meaning is understood when *kṣa* is uttered as, e. g., the constant (meaning of) existence which (is understood) in *bhavati*, *bhavataḥ*, *bhavanti*. Therefore phonemes are meaningless like the stanza ' ten pomgranates ...' by direct perception and inference. " *Prativarṇam* " : (the word) *prati* heard in the Vārttika is *karmapravacanīya* when it denotes *lakṣaṇa* ' towards ' etc., hence he asks : " What is this (expression) *prativarṇam* ? " The other one demonstrates pervasion by reduplication with (the explanation) *varṇaṁ varṇaṁ prati*. And (the repeated utterance expressive of) pervasion retires in the compound, since it is conveyed (by the compound) as in *saptaparṇa*, *aṣṭapada* etc.

[5. 2]

" And because of perception of (the same) meaning (even) after an interchange, loss, addition and modification of phonemes " (*Vār*. 15). This is not a reason proving meaninglessness (of phonemes). What then ? A reason showing the fallacy in the statement of the opponent. Here *vyatyaya* ' interchange ' (means), of the two (phonemes) situated in a whole, (taking) of the final position by the initial one, and that of the initial position by the final one. (In metathes) is the utterance consists of reversion of temporal sequence. This inference is stated with reference to (i. e. for refuting) (the argument in favour of) meaningfulness of phonemes other than verbal roots etc. Here (in *tarku* etc.)

no interchange of meaning is seen after an interchange of phonemes. If phonemes were each of them meaningful in company with one another, then just as there is a different understanding (of meaning) owing to (an interchanged) use of the words *ādi* 'beginning' and *anta* 'end' in *ādyantau* 'beginning and end' and *antādī* 'end and beginning', similarly it would be here also. And if you think: The meaning, (which is) one and the same, is complete in each one of all the phonemes (and so the interchange cannot be demonstrated), even then there is a variety of interchange (of understandings) (which is difficult to explain) — in some cases (there is) an understanding of a different meaning, in some (there is) an understanding of the same meaning in (words) like *tarku* while in yet others (there is) just meaninglessness as in *kāka* and *kakā*. — Just as there is a loss of the phoneme *v* (in *vṛkṣa*) and (correspondingly) a different meaning is understood, similarly in *ghnanti* (there is) a loss of the phoneme *a*, but there is no understanding of a different meaning. Therefore there is no inference of the meaningfulness. "*Lavitā, lavitum*": Verily, when there is an addition of a meaningful Pada, addition of meaning also is seen, as *dattaḥ*, *yajñadattaḥ*. Or when a word proceeds with inferred meaningfulness (it will bring about) imparting of meaning as (*a* in) *aupagava* 'descendant of Upagu.' Not so a grammatical augment. Whence, then, meaningfulness of a phoneme? Substitution (in *ghātayati* etc.) is like *yūpa* etc. Here also some phoneme goes, another comes in, (but) (there is) no understanding of a different meaning.

[6]

"Both these (views) have been expressed about phonemes". He asks thus: Is it to be held, because of (the meaningfulness of) verbal roots etc., that all (phonemes) are meaningful, and that non-perception (of meaning) (in other phonemes) is due to some reason? Or (is it to be held), because of meaninglessness in some, that everywhere there is a meaninglessness (and that) in verbal roots etc. this (meaningfulness is) an illusion, as in the case of a firebrand wheel? "'Both', he says". He pleads for this (view): The perception and non-perception of meaning should be regarded as having different domains. Where a practical meaningfulness is possible (to be assumed) on the basis of inference, (it) should be assumed there. And it is observed that when all have a common aim, there is achievement with somebody, (but) not in the case of some other. So he says this: "Of those striving after a common aim". "These are different wholes altogether". This is a statement of fact. For, where (there is) inferential meaningfulness, continuity of a major part of meaning is observed where there is a possibility of a common word; (and) only a small difference is made by the change in the suffix, (e. g.) in *pakti*, *pacana* and *pāka*, where only a difference of gender is made by the (different) suffixes.

(But) here along with (the so-called) continuity of the word *ūpa* no continuity of meaning is observed. So it should not be held that while the word *ūpa* is constant, there (is) only a change of phoneme. " This, indeed, by you ". This is stated: If the status of an altogether different whole is not admitted, meaninglessness results all-too-more, since many words will have to be admitted as meaningless. It is but proper that the word *ūpa* which is (regarded as) constant should convey (its) meaning. If it does not convey, then meaninglessness is admitted. " And because of the meaningfulness of the whole " (*Vār*. 12). " (He) will give a reply to this (in the *Vār*. 11 under P. 1. 2. 45). " 'The meaningfulness of the whole is observed even when a part does not have that meaning, as in the case of the ingredients of liquor or the parts of a chariot '.

V

[1]

" How is it that the code-letters in the Akṣarasamāmnāya are not (comprehended) in the mentionings of *ac* ? " For, these too have been read as included in it (i. e. *ac*) and are also present. And (just as) the phoneme *h* has been read more than once on purpose, similarly these too may have been uttered many times on purpose.

[2. 1]

" From the practice (of teachers) " ... The teachers have so proceeded viz. that they did not execute the *ac*-operations. (E. g.) *tṛṣi-muṣi-kṛṣeḥ* ... (P. 1. 2. 25) (where *yaṇ*-Saṁdhi has not been effected). Such being the case, just as the use of the form *sarvanāmāni* (in P. 1. 1. 27) supersedes *ṇ*-substitution which becomes due by the general rule, similarly the use (of *tṛṣi-muṣi* ... etc.) supersedes the *yaṇ* substitution when *hal*-s (consonants) follow, even if there is comprehension (of *ṇ*, *k* etc. by *ac*). This is one assumption. Or, it is inferred from the practice that the utterance of these (code-letters) as occupying this position is not in their capacity as effective ones. The phonemes *a* etc. alone are here effective in the matter of *ādir antyena sahetā* (P. 1. 1. 71), not these.

[2. 2]

" Because of the subordinate character ". By this the relationship of the principal and the subordinate is stated. The subordinate, adopted as qualifier to the principal, is impossible to be reckoned as (its) equal in the matter of participation in operations; so the code-letters, adopted as qualifiers, have no participation in operations. Just as the bases etc. have no designation *pratyaya* for the two reasons stated : By the one ineffectiveness is conveyed (according

to the *Vār.* 2 on P. 3. 1. 1) : 'Because a condition is meant for the sake of operation for that in connection with which a condition (is laid down)'; by the other a relationship of the principal and the subordinate results (according to the *Vār.* 3 on P. 3. 1. 1) : 'Because an operation is understood as touching the principal', similarly here also there is no comprehension (of the code-letters) because of their ineffectiveness and subordinateness. "Whence this?" This is the idea : Just as the lists of *gargādi* and *bidādi* (words) serve two purposes, similarly this list of the code-letters also may be for its own sake and for something different also. This he controverts on the basis of the practice of teachers itself. Just as people proceed (in similar matters) — when those of one's own caste, the Brāhmaṇas, are present, (people) will eat with the Brāhmaṇas alone, when Kṣatriyas (are present), with Kṣatriyas, similarly here also this same style is observed. (The word) *śailī* (is derived as) *śīle bhavā* 'what results from *śīla*'. (It means) a procedure preceded by concentration of mind.

[2. 3]

"And the deletion (of the code-letter) (is) stronger". If (this) logical explanation is not accepted, (well,) admit the non-comprehension for this (reason)! By the abbreviation *ac* the code-letter (*c*) alone is accepted by *ādir antyena* ... (P. 1. 1. 71). It is known that the name *it* is given to what does not exist. Itself not existent, it occupies itself with operations. For, it is said : 'The existence (of a code-letter) is for a grammatical operation, (its) deletion (is) for ensuring its non-hearing' (P. 1. 3. 9, *Vār.* 8). So how can there be comprehension of something which does not exist?

[2. 4]

"Or, (let) *ūkālo 'c* (be) the rule". The *ac*-status being (already) established by *ādir antyena* ... (P. 1. 1. 71), the splitting (of P. 1. 2. 27) is effected so that (a phoneme) which is characterized by (the specific) duration (alone) be entitled to the *ac*-status. Just as when there is an employment (of *pra* etc.) before or after (the verb), the names *gati* and *upasarga*, which become due, are restricted : On the view that (the purpose of P. 1. 4. 80 is) the restriction of the names, the names *gati* and *upasarga* become applicable (for *pra* etc.) (only when) they are employed before. The idea is that the phonemes having a duration of half a mora do not have *ūkāla* (i. e. the moras 1, 2 and 3). — Even then (the name *ac*) becomes due undesiredly even (for *-kk-*) in *kukkuṭa*. — But how (can there be) the inclusion of this (*kk*) in the abbreviation which is not read (in the alphabet)? — Because of the understanding of the universal — that is the idea. The universal is uttered (in the alphabet), (and the universal) sometimes depends upon (a phoneme of) half a

mora, and sometimes upon that of one mora. It is manifested, sometimes by one consonant, sometimes by two. And on this (*ākṛti-*) view, the rule of comprehension (of homogeneous sounds) viz. *aṇ udit savarṇasya ca* (P. 1. 1. 69) has been rejected.

[2. 4. 1]

This one says: "Let the rule be only as far as that (part) which precedes the statement of short etc." (That is) let the rule be as far as the wording which precedes *hrasvadīrghaplutaḥ*. How far? This, viz. *ūkālo 'c*. This is (what is) said here: This is an individualistic reference. This also is (valid), viz. (the rule) *aṇ udit ...* In the alphabet the *ū*-duration is resorted to: (a phoneme) included in the alphabet, which has an *ū*-duration, is (called) *ac*. And this (name) *ac* is only an illustration. It should be declared that, whether *ac* or *aṇ*, (the condition of duration) applies to phonemes in the alphabet. Therefore, in the absence of the designation *aṇ*, *ṇ* etc. do not have the power of comprehending. ... ...

VI

"Now, for what reason (the reading) of semivowels". This (is what is) asked here: For what reason is the abbreviation (*aṇ*) made with *ṇ* in *aṇ udit savarṇasya* ... (P. 1. 1. 69) thus including semivowels in it, instead of making the abbreviation with *c* (i. e. as *ac*)? Otherwise, if the semivowels are not read here, the *iṇ* mentionings will be devoid of semivowels. As a result of it there will not be *ṣ*-substitution in *gīrṣu halṣu* etc.

"But it makes a difference". (He) says this, taking into consideration the auditory difference. "This, then, remains extremely uncertain (whether) the teachers ...". They infer the continuation of *vibhāṣā* 'optionally' on the strength of indicatory clue. (This) remains uncertain owing to the inconclusiveness of this inference of theirs.

[*laṇ* / 6]

[1]

"This phoneme *ṇ* is affixed twice". In this section, six categories have been introduced/implied: Vicinity, pervasion, capability, (earlier) establishment, indication, (and) economy. By the logic of vicinity, and because of absence of any reason in transgressing the order of succession, (the abbreviation) could be with the preceding (*ṇ*). By the logic of pervasion, which helps comprehension of many, (the abbreviation) should be with the succeeding (*ṇ*). Such being the

case, whether (there is to be) vicinity or pervasion is subject to doubt. Here on the force of the reading of two *ṇ*-s the vicinity stands, pervasion is superseded.

"Of *aṇ* (which is) not *pragṛhya*". The Bhāṣyakāra himself has talked, in the 8th chapter, about *vṛkṣav karoti*. Such being the case, it is not understood with what idea he (now) says: "Succeeding *aṇ*-s are not possible as finals of a pada".

'*Ajarghāḥ*' is a form of the root *gṛdh*, ending in (frequentative) *yaṅ* (subsequently) dropped, followed by *laṅ* (Imperfect) replaced by *sip* (of the 2nd, sing.). Similarly *apāspāḥ* of *spardh*.

"(He) reads the word *dhātu*". It is possible to say here on the strength of the reading of the word *dhātu* (in P. 7. 1. 100) that only (an additional) mora comes into existence, there is no relationship of the original and the substitute. But this conflicts with the difficulty in *cikīrṣati* etc. (pointed out in the *Mbh.*). "Then here also (the substitute) is not available: *cikīrṣati, jihīrṣati*". This is objected to (thus): when the *r*-suffixion is warded off on the strength of the reading of the word *dhātu*, why, the *i*-substitution in *cikīrṣati* is a *fait accompli*! [Reply:] This is the idea (of the opponent): The *r*-suffixion is warded off on the strength of the reading of the word *dhātu* only in the case of (a word-element) other than a verbal root; in the case of a verbal root, however, the *r*-suffixion is sure to be there. And then, since there is no final position (of *ṝ*), there is no prospect (of *i*-substitution) in *cikīrṣati* etc. Or, the reading of the word *dhātu* may be for this purpose, viz. that when *r*-suffixion is effected everywhere, (and consequently) when *i*-substitution is not available because of the absence of final position (of *ṝ*), *i*-substitution (could) be effected in the place of *ṝ*, no matter what position it may be occupying in a verbal root. "Doesn't matter (if *i*-substitution is not thus available). (It) will be there by *upadhāyāś ca* (P. 7. 1. 101)". "In that case", in the absence of the reading of the word *dhātu* "here also (*i*-substitution) becomes due in *mātṝṇām*", for, after *r*-suffixion (*ṝ*) has the penultimate position. "Therefore, the reading of the word *dhātu* has got to be done". And the drawback which is pointed out (viz.) *udāttādiṣu raparatvam* (*Vār.* 5) in *ur aṇ raparaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 51), that is still there in *kṛti* etc. if the abbreviation is formed with the succeeding (*ṇ*). Thus when pervasion is superseded on the strength of the otherwise superflousness, this is established, viz. abbreviation with the preceding (*ṇ*). Therefore he asks because of the establishment (of *āsatti*):

"Well, then (there is) doubt about this (reading of *aṇ*)": Is establishment (of *āsatti*) (to be followed) here, or pervasion? — Establishment is superseded by indication. "The reading *aṇ* in the *savarṇa* rule (P. 1. 1. 69)". Hence, indeed "*ur ṛt* '*ṛ* is substituted in the place of *ṝ̆*'". (E. g.) *acīkṛtat*.

The *t*-suffixion is proper, being meant to ensure one-mora (*ṛ*) in the place of *ṝ*. (Objection :) But surely there cannot be a comprehension (of the homogeneous) by (a phoneme) which is being brought into existence ? — True. It is so. Still, there is a possibility of (such a) comprehension which is warded off by special effort. Therefore, here establishment is superseded by indication.

" Then (there is) doubt about tbe reading of *iṇ* ".... [" That becomes cumbersome "]. Here pervasion is (resorted to) by reason of brevity, and not the vicinity. (Objection :) But the duration of a consonant follows that of a vowel. Such being the case whatever (is) the duration of vowels, the same (is the duration) of preceding consonants. (Reply :) This is a view of (only) some. (In the view) of others the duration differs. Or, *gaurava* (is) uttering with difficulty, *lāghava*, uttering with ease. " There is this rule of interpretation ". Even though the listener may not easily understand its meaning (i. e. the meaning of an obscure rule), still its power to express a particular meaning is not obstructed. Therefore the teacher uses such a one, thinking that the particular meaning is understood from the commentarial explanation.

[*ña ma ṅa ṇa na m* / *jha bha ñ* / 7, 8]

[1]

" For what reason are these two (affixed) ? " He asks (this) because there is a cumbersomeness owing to activity at two places and also ...

" Even then (there are) five augments ", (viz.) *ṅ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *jh* and *bh*. " Three elements-to-be-augmented ", (viz.) *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*. Therefore for each element-to-be-augmented there will be five (augments). " Let there be such augments as have elements-to-be-augmented ". Here *uddeśa* and *anudeśa* are fixed by grammar. Such being the case, the augments, which are known as each having a respective (*āgamin*) from grammar itself which is independent of the usage, each distributed suitably to itself, proceed (subsequently) at the time of usage. There *jh* and *bh* do not proceed, because there are no elements-to-be-augmented (in their case). And they do not proceed again, in the domain of *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*, because of the absence of (re-)injunction.

[The nine (remaining) Sūtras should be understood to have been dropped (in the *Mbh.*) for the reason that they are as good as explained by this (foregoing) explanation itself].

[2]

" Now, what is this *akṣara* ? " According to some, (it is) the phoneme (that is called) *akṣara*, according to others, the inflected word and the

sentence. And it has been said : ' He, who ... [utters] this [speech] according to the accent, the *akṣara* ... (*Mbh*. I. 3. 12) '.

" One should understand *akṣara* (as meaning) ' not perishable ' ". (*Akṣara* is) an action-word like *pācaka* ' one who cooks '. *Akṣara* (is so called) because (it) does not perish, does not decay. *Na kṣarati* is not well known. (So) he explains it by the well known (expression) *na kṣīyate*. Just as *kṣaṇa* ' a moment ' (is derived) from *kṣaṇ*. (It, i. e. a moment) is time which is *prakṣṇuta* ' minutely cut up '. *Kṣṇauti* (i. e. $\sqrt{}$*kṣṇu*) means ' to perish '.

" Or, *akṣara* (is derived) from $\sqrt{}$*aś* with (the suffix) *sara* ". *Akṣara* (is so called) because it pervades meaning — *aśnute* = *vyāpnoti* ; or because it is pervaded by meaning. And that is an inflected word, (and) a sentence.

" Or, in the old Sūtra, they have defined *akṣara* as *varṇa* ". It is now told that (*akṣara* is) a (mere) name. For it is read by others as : *varṇā akṣarāṇi*.

" Why is there the instruction (in phonemes) ? " Surely the correctness of phonemes is not to be taught (in grammar). Of what, then ? Of the whole, that being used to convey meaning.

" Grammar binds the speech ". *Varṇajñāna* (means) that by which *varṇa*-s are learnt. But what is it ? Grammar. That is the *viṣaya* ' binder ' of speech. Verily, speech is bound, (i. e.) fastened, in grammar.

" And, where the Brahman resides " (means) and where Brahman, i. e. the Veda, resides. And where does (it) reside ? In the inflected word. The grammer is the binder of this phoneme. This (is what) he says : of worldly words also.

" For its sake ". *Varṇajñānam* ' grammar ' is referred to by *tad* ' it '. The phonemes are uttered for the functioning of grammar. Just what was said by the Vākyakāra viz. *Vṛttisamavāyārtha upadeśaḥ* (*Mbh*. Āhn. I, *Vār*. 15), the same now the author of the Ślokavārttikas also is saying.

" For the sake of understanding of the desired (phonemes) ". (This means to understand the phonemes) free from (the defects) *kala* etc.

" Instruction is given for easiness (of understanding) also." And by this (he) points to the affixion of code-letters (mentioned in) " And for the sake of affixion of code-letters also " (*Mbh*. Āhn. I, *Vār*. 16).

" This Akṣarasamāmnāya (alphabet) (is) the entire linguistic usage ". Speech is laid down to be this much, this much the linguistic usage. " Blossomed and fruitful ", (viz.) with the seen and the unseen result, (i. e.) with the

worldly prosperity and the highest good (respectively). " Adorned like the moon and the stars ". This is (what is) said : Just as this thing, viz. the moon and the stars etc., is uninterrupted, similarly there is no creator of this linguistic usage; this (has been) simply so, being remembered, (and) remembered. " The piled-up Brahman ". Like the piled-up Brahman, in which sequence has been withdrawn (and) which resides in every man, so also (is) this alphabet — it is possible to say so. Like the spiritual Brahman (this also) is filled with the Brahman. " When this is known, there is an aquisition of the fruit of merit of (the study of) all the Vedas ". (This means that) he obtains that which is the fruit of merit (which results) after the study of all the Vedas. " His mother and father ... ". Study should not be given up even after their death, so that they may get the desired fruit. Or even when they are alive (the study should not be given up) so that when they will die they will go to heaven. Thus the other one is encouraged towards the study.

NOTES

a i u ṇ / 1

[1]

अकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः is a part of the first *Vār.* which runs as : **अकारस्य विवृतोपदेश आकारग्रहणार्थः ।** There is no predicate in the *Vār.* Pat. actually supplies **कर्तव्यः**, still there is some discussion in the *Mbh.* (and, then, of course in the *Dīp.*) and Pat. seems to be in favour of **कृतः**.

स्पृष्टतादयश्चत्वारः ... The four manners of pronunciation referred to here are : (i) **स्पृष्ट** (occlusive), (ii) **ईषत्स्पृष्ट** (slightly touched), (iii) **संवृत** (close), and (iv) **विवृत** (open). Called 'internal effort' (**आभ्यन्तरप्रयत्न**), they decide, along with the other factor, viz. the place of articulation, the homogeneity or otherwise of two phonemes, cf. P. 1. 1. 9 : **तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं सवर्णम्**.

Observation : There is some uncertainty as to whether by *upadeśa* in the *Vār.* is meant the actual pronunciation or a mere declaration (*pratijñā*) of the openness of *a* in the grammatical system. Although Bhar. here seems to be of the view that actual pronunciation is meant, later on (1. 8. 1) he has used the word *pratijñātaḥ* also. Later authors are generally in favour of this latter view, cf. Nāg. : भाष्ये 'कर्तव्यः' इत्यस्य प्रतिज्ञेयः इत्यर्थः । एतेन तस्योच्चारयितुमशक्यत्वमित्यपास्तम् । On this the *chāyā* : ... करोतिना प्रतिज्ञानस्य लक्षणात् ।

In the following lines Bhar. gives his view from **ननु च नियतप्रयत्नत्वात्** onwards.

(*p.* 1, *l.* 6) **वक्त्रा प्रमादात्** and **शक्यते प्रमादात्** in older editions. This is evidently wrong. **अप्रमाद** 'carefulness, conscious effort' is meant.

अतश्च शक्यते ... The very fact that Kāt. insists on the open articulation is a proof that it is not impossible. — Although the MS reads **अतश्च**, it is very probable that Bhar. wrote **आतश्च**, which is a mannerism of Pat.

[1. 1]

In this section, Bhar. discusses the element *kāra* seen in words like *akāra*. The main point here stressed is that *varṇa-* (in *varṇāt*) does not mean a phoneme, but an expression (may be consisting of more than one phoneme) which denotes a phoneme. Since the stem itself denotes that particular phoneme, the suffix *kāra* is regarded as *svārthe*.

(*l.* 10) The MS clearly reads वर्णाभिधेयतायां, but from what Bhar. says below (*l.* 13 : एवमर्थमेवेदमुपन्यस्तम् ' वर्णाभिधायिनोऽयं प्रत्यय ' इति), it seems that he read वर्णाभिधायिनोऽयं here also. — (*l.* 14) अनच्कम्, say *k*. साच्क, i. e. *ka*. वर्णात् here practically means वर्णसमुदायात् (*k*+*a*). The phoneme conveyed (प्रतिपाद्य-मानस्) by *kakāra* is however purely *k*. — यथा जिह्वामूलीयो° ... This gives a parallel. Jihvāmūlīya (the half Visarga before *k*, *kh*) and Upadhmānīya (one before *p*, *ph*) are usually written as ᳵ*k* and ᳶ*p* respectively (cf. P. 8. 3. 37 : कुप्वोᳵकᳶपौ च). Although the letters *k* and *p* occur in the name (and are pronounced also), the phoneme named, which is understood, is pure (i. e. without *k* and *p*).

Observation : It is not clear why Bhar. uses *kh* and *ph* instead of the usual *k* and *p*.

Readings : (1) (*l.* 15) Sw reads °ध्मानीयानु°. The MS reading °ध्मानीयावु° does not require any modification. °ध्मानीयाव् is Acc. dual (while the following उपस्थितौ is Nom. dual). — (2) (*l.* 15) The MS प्रतिपत्तैः तु is not clear. Sw emends it into °पत्तैस्तु, though apparently without improving the situation. I think Bhar. wrote °पत्तौ, which of course should refer to जिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयौ.

[1. 2]

The point raised here by Bhar. does not seem to be pursued by Kaiy. and Nāg. — स एवायम् : Bhar.'s favourite formula for describing identity elsewhere is सोऽयमिति (अभिसंबन्ध), cf. *Vākyap.* 2. 40, 3. 14. 84, 3. 14. 343, 3. 14. 228 etc.

Reading : The MS reads °त्वाध्यवसायि° which is retained by AL, while emended into °त्वाध्यवसायित्वात् by Sw. I prefer reading °त्वाध्यवसाये.

[1. 3]

The *pratīka* अकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः is quoted once more in the *Dīp.*, but this time with a different purpose, viz. to investigate into the correctness or otherwise of the formation of the compound *vivṛtopadeśaḥ*.

(*l.* 21) विवृतशब्दस्य सापेक्षत्वात् ... °नुपपत्तिः. ननु was expected at the beginning here. Cf. उच्यते which follows. The objection that the word *vivṛta* cannot enter into a compound with *upadeśa* is raised on the maxim : सापेक्षमसमर्थं भवति (*Mbh.* I. 360. 19) 'what is expectant (of an outside word) is (regarded as) semantically unconnected'. सापेक्षत्वात्=अकारेण सापेक्षत्वात् । असामर्थ्यें=उपदेश-शब्देन सह सामर्थ्याभावे । Here four different explanations are given to justify the compound : (1) words which are *sāpekṣa* in an ordinary way may not form a compound; but those which are always expectant (the *nityasāpekṣa* words) *can*

form a compound.[1] Words expressive of quality (like *vivṛta* in question) belong to this category, since they always imply some possessor of the quality (*guṇin*). Cf. Kaiy. : विवृतस्य गुणस्योपदेशः विवृतोपदेशः । तत्र गुणस्य नित्यसापेक्षत्वादकारापेक्षत्वेऽपि समासः । यथा देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलमिति । — Nāg. has incidentally also suggested that if the word *vivṛta* is understood as denoting a *guṇin* (the open vowel), then the maxim सविशेषणानां वृत्तिर्न will prevent the compound : ननु विवृतपदस्य गुणिपरत्वे सविशेषणत्वात् समासो न स्यादत आह — विवृतस्य गुणस्येति । (2) The whole compound विवृतोपदेशः is qualified by the qualifier *akārasya*. Naturally a part of that whole, viz. *vivṛta* is also covered by it, although it is integrated into a compound.

In explaining the (already quoted) *sāpekṣa* formation देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्, Pat. has already given a similar explanation. Read : समुदायापेक्षात्र षष्ठी सर्वं गुरुकुलमपेक्षते (*Mbh.* I. 360. 23–24). Bhar. expresses the idea in the *Vāk.* also. Read :

समुदायेन संबन्धो येषां गुरुकुलादिना ।
संस्पृश्यावयवांस्ते च युज्यन्ते तद्वता सह ॥ (वाक्यप॰ ३. १४. ४८)

Mark the use of the identical verb *saṁ-spṛś* (and of the word *avayava*) in both, the *Dīp.* and the *Vāk.* (3) The force of *gamakatva*. For *gamakatva*, read the *Mbh.* : इह समानार्थेन वाक्येन भवितव्यं समासेन च । यश्चेहार्थो वाक्येन गम्यते ' महत् कष्टं श्रितः ' इति, नासौ जातुचित् समासेन गम्यते ' महत्कष्टश्रितः ' इति[2] । एतस्माद्धेतोर्ब्रूमः अगमकत्वादिति, न ब्रूमः अपशब्दः स्यादिति (I. 361. 11–13). The इह in *Mbh.* passage इह गमकत्वाद् वृत्तिर्भविष्यति refers to the denominative formation मुण्डयति माणवकम्. (4) We take the underlying phrase to be अकारस्य विवृतेन उपदेशः and form the compound of विवृतेन + उपदेशः = विवृतोपदेशः. Here विवृतेन is not syntactically connected with अकारस्य and so there is no difficulty in combining विवृतेन with उपदेशः.

[1. 4]

सूत्रोच्चारणादेवाधिगतमनेन ... Here अनेन means शिष्येण. Cf. e. g. the usages in the *Mbh.* : मृजिरस्मा अविशेषेणोपदिष्टः । तस्य सर्वत्र मृजिबुद्धिः प्रसक्ता (I. 41. 2–3). Also : वृधिरस्मा अविशेषेणोपदिष्टः प्रकृतिपाठे (I. 39. 15–16). The *chāyā* under these passages paraphrases अस्मै by साधुशब्दबुभुत्सवे and तस्य by साधुशब्दबुभुत्सोः respectively. Correspondingly the सूत्रोच्चारण is to be ascribed to the teacher. The idea is that when the teacher will read out the Sū. अइउण्, he will utter *a* as open. By its very hearing the pupil will know the open manner of articulation. Where is

1. Cf. संबन्धिशब्दः सापेक्षो नित्यं सर्वः प्रयुज्यते ।
स्वार्थवत् सा व्यपेक्षास्य वृत्तावपि न हीयते ॥ वाक्यप॰ ३. १४. ४७.
2. Cf. Kaiy. : यः कष्टश्रितः स महत्कर्म करोतीत्यादि प्रतीयेत, क्रियाविशेषणं वा महत्त्वं प्रतीयेत, न तु कष्टविशेषणम् ।

then the need of a specific statement to that effect? Before कश्चिद् विशेषः, a word like उच्यते is understood.

(*p.* 2, *l.* 7) The MS reads विवृतोदुर्वेद्योभ्यासात्. To tide over the difficulty which is obviously involved here, AL split विवृतोदुर्वेद्यो as विवृतोऽदुर्वेद्यो, which means *vivṛta* 'not difficult to perceive with practice'. But the intended meaning is rather 'difficult to perceive without practice'. So, keeping दुर्वेद्यो as it is, I emend भ्यासात् into ऽ[न]भ्यासात्. — (*p.* 2, *l.* 7) For the clear reading of the MS विवृतोऽयमुपदिष्ट इति, Sw unnecessarily reads विवृतोपदेश इति, evidently to make it agree with the reading of the *Vār.* But that is unnecessary.

[1. 5]

Another view: According to this view, *a* as pronounced in the Śivasūtra is not *vivṛta*, but the one reverted to *saṁvṛta*. It is, further, an imitative name (*anukaraṇa*) of the actual *a* sound in words like *aśva* (which is *saṁvṛta*). Whether the *a* in the Śivasūtra is an imitative name of some particular *a* in the language or of the universal *a* depends upon what view one holds about the phonemes, the individualistic view (व्यक्तिपक्ष) or universalistic view (आकृतिपक्ष). It is the Vārttikakāra who pronounces *a* here as *vivṛta* in order to announce (*āśravaṇārtham*) this character of *a* in grammar. Although pronounced open, this *a* of the Śivasūtra can refer to the close *a* of the actual language, the same as the cerebralised forms of the root, viz. *ṣṭhā*, and of the suffix, viz. *ṭran*, refer to the non-cerebralised forms *sthā* and *tran* respectively. That is how the actual close *a* of the language is taught to be *open* in the system by the Vārttikakāra.

(*p.* 2, *l.* 13) तस्मिंश्च प्रयोग° ... विकारः प्रवर्तते । The expression धात्वादिविकारः is ambiguous. It probably here means 'modification of roots etc.' referring to the operation taught in P. 6. 1. 64: धात्वादेः षः सः.

(*p.* 2, *l.* 15) तत्राक्षरसमाम्नायिकस्य प्रत्यापत्तौ सर्वे कृतप्रत्यापत्तयः strictly should apply only to the आकृतिपक्ष. Bhar. here is silent as to what happens on the व्यक्तिपक्ष.

[1. 6]

A third view: *a* in the Śivasūtra is not a reverted form denotative of something. It is *vivṛta* and has nothing to denote. — अनर्थकः, since it does not denote or stand for anything else apart from its own form.

[1. 7]

This section discusses the question whether the reply given in the *Vār.* viz. आकारग्रहणार्थः is given in the correct form, i. e. in the form required by the form

of the question. The prima facie view is that, strictly, it should have been आकारग्रहणम् (*kiṁ prayojanam ? ākāragrahaṇam*). Unfortunately the reply is lost most probably owing to a gap in the text of the MS. The following words : कदाचिद्धर्मी धर्म° etc. have nothing to do with the question discussed here. So I presume that there is a gap here, though the MS does not show any sign of it. Very likely the words उच्यते । कदाचिद्धर्मी stand at the beginning of a reply to *another* question. Since the replies to both the questions probably began with उच्यते, there might have been here a hapl. omission.

Coming to the objection : नन्वेवं निर्देष्टव्यम् 'आकारग्रहणम्' इति, the reply in the lost portions to guess from Kaiy's words, may have been something like this : The reply आकारग्रहणार्थः, merely quoted by Pat., is in coordination with the preceding words of the Vār. viz. आकारस्यविवृतोपदेशः. There is nothing wrong there. As to its fitness in the *Mbh.* sentence, it comes to mean : आकारग्रहणं विवृतस्य प्रयोजनम् and so there is nothing objectionable. Read Kaiy. : 'विवृतोपदेश आकारग्रहणार्थः' इति सामानाधिकरण्येन निर्देशाद् आकारग्रहणं विवृतोपदेशस्य प्रयोजनमिति सामर्थ्यादवगमाच्चोद्यानुरूपम् उत्तरं न भवतीति न चोदनीयम् ।

[1. 8]

As said above, there is a gap in the *Dīpikā*. The *Mbh.* on the *Vār.* runs as follows :

'आकारस्य विवृतोपदेश आकारग्रहणार्थः' (वा. १) ।

'अकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः कर्तव्यः' । किं प्रयोजनम् ? 'आकारग्रहणार्थः' । अकारः सवर्णग्रहणेनाकारमपि यथा गृह्णीयात् । किं च कारणं न गृह्णीयात् ? विवारभेदात् । किमुच्यते विवारभेदादिति, न पुनः कालभेदादपि ? यथैव ह्ययं विवारभिन्नः, एवं कालभिन्नोऽपि । सत्यमेव तत् । वक्ष्यति 'तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं सवर्णम्' (पा. १. १. ९) इत्यत्रास्यग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनम् — आस्ये येषां तुल्यो देशः प्रयत्नश्च ते सवर्णसंज्ञा भवन्तीति । बाह्यश्च पुनरास्यात् कालः । तेन स्यादेव कालभिन्नस्य ग्रहणम्, न पुनर्विवारभिन्नस्य ।

Much of the *Dīpikā* — we do not know how much it was — is lost in the gap. It resumes at कदाचिद्धर्मी धर्मव्यपदेशकः (*l.* 21) from which onwards the *Dīp.* is seen to be justifying the *Mbh.* statement : बाह्यश्च पुनरास्यात् कालः ।

I have supplied an उच्यते at the beginning of this *Dīp.* passage to account for what I regard as a hapl. omission. Now उच्यते usually begins a reply to a preceding objection. What could have been the objection here which is lost in the gap ? To judge from the reply, it must have been against the *Mbh.* statement which says that time is outside the oral cavity (बाह्यश्च पुनरास्यात् कालः). Now time is omnipresent. How could it be said to be outside the oral cavity ?— that must have been the objection. Cf. Nāg. : ननु कालस्य व्यापकत्वाद् बाह्यत्वेन समाधानमयुक्तम् ... इत्यत आह ।

Two arguments are given in the *Dīp.* in justification of the *Mbh.* statement. The first extends from कदाचिद्धर्मी up to एवास्य व्यापारः and the second from अथाप्याद्य एव यत्नः up to बाह्यत्वमस्त्येव ।

कदाचिद्धर्मी .... This is the argument : An object possesses many properties. The object may be called after one or more of these properties. A bull, for example, has horns, a hump etc. and so he is called by names like *viṣāṇin*, *kakudmat*, etc. With such particular names the object also is so to say particularised. Thus, though time is one and indivisible, it is called 'short' 'long' etc. What Bhar. here probably means to say (though I am not very sure of it) is that by *kāla* 'time' in the *Mbh.* here it is not the abstract and ubiquitous entity, the Time, which is to be understood, but rather the specific durations, short or long, of the vowels *a* or *ā* etc. Bhar. further says (in तत्र यस्याम् ... °स्य व्यापारः) that when vowels of longer duration (like *dīrgha*, *pluta*) are produced, the activity of speech organs in the oral cavity has already come to a stop. The longer duration (*kāla*) is due to the activity of first sounds (which takes place outside the mouth) and not to the initial activity of the speech organs (which, as said above, already ceases). The factors responsible for the duration (i. e. continued perception) of a sound are outside the mouth. Bhar. therefore concludes that Pat. rightly says : बाह्यश्च पुनरास्यात् कालः. (The duration [*kāla*] cannot therefore constitute an *ābhyantara prayatna* and consequently it is not a factor to be considered in determining the homogeneity of *a* and *ā* — that is the ultimate point.) — (*p.* 2, *l.* 23) अवस्था, the stage, i. e. the stage in the production of a speech sound. करणसंनिपात, the coming together of speech-organs, i. e. the articulator and the point of articulation. After करणसंनिपाताद् we have evidently to supply ऊर्ध्वम् 'after, subsequent to'.

Observation : This first explanation given by Bhar. does not find a place in Kaiy.'s comm. Did he too have his difficulties in understanding Bhar. ? On the other hand he first gives an explanation which is based on the doctrine क्रियैव कालः, नातिरिक्तः. Read : प्रसिद्धपरिमाणवस्त्वन्तरगतपरिच्छेदकक्रियान्तरापेक्षणात् कालव्यवहारस्य, बाह्यत्वं कालस्य । यथा व्रीहेः प्रस्थादिव्यवहारः परिमाणद्रव्यकृतः, एवं मात्रादिव्यपदेशो निमेषादिकृतः । Granting that the divisions in time are not inherent in it but that they are due to extraneous activities, I am unable to see what this has to do in the present context where the difference between the *bāhya* and the *ābhyantara* efforts (which decide the homogeneity of phonemes) is the matter in hand.

(*p.* 2, *l.* 25) अथाप्याद्य एव यत्नः ... बाह्यत्वमस्त्येव. Another reason for कालस्य आस्याद् बाह्यत्वम्. It is given on the view that the activity of the speech organs itself is responsible for the length of phonemes, i. e. the activity of the

speech organs determines the duration of sounds before it ceases itself. Even accepting this view, says Bhar., it is ultimately the activity at the navel, the activity of determining and controlling the amount and the duration of the emitting of the breath, that effects the duration of a speech sound. — आद्यः यत्नः, initial effort i. e. the activity of speech organs. We accept (at least for the time being), says Bhar., that the duration is not caused by the first sound (which is the result of the activity of the speech organs), but by the preceding activity, viz. the activity of the speech organs. But still that does not make duration an internal affair. Why should we stop, Bhar. seems to ask, at the activity of the speech organs in the oral cavity ? Why should we not go still back to the navel, the centre which determines and controls the outgoing breath and which is therefore responsible for producing the desired duration ? And surely the region of the navel is outside the oral cavity.

The passage अथाप्याद्य एव ... बाह्यत्वमस्त्येव is not free from corruptions. What AL read as अथ बाह्य एव and SW as अथाबाह्यमेव, I read as अथाप्याद्य एव. Only, I emend द्यमे into द्य ए so as to bring the adjective in agreement with the noun यत्नः. The MS शकरोन्मजुरेने is a hard nut to crack. AL emend it into शर्करोन्मज्जनेन which I have provisionally followed but, frankly, I do not know what it means. SW simply reads शकरोत्मुक्तरेने — apparently that is how he reads the MS itself. — The MS आक्षेपविशेषसत is read as °षे सत by AL and as °ष सत by SW. I emend it as °षस्त[त] एव which should be readily acceptable. — The expression आक्षेपविशेष occurs in the *Vāk*. 2. 20. — [ए]वमर्थप्रयुक्तंमाणो of the MS is again corrupt. AL emend it into °र्थं प्रयुज्यमानो which I have also followed here though I am not quite satisfied with it. — वायोः प्रकारप्रयत्नमारभ्यते is again corrupt. AL emend it to °कारः प्रयत्नमारभते.

[1. 8. 1]

This section discusses how the eternality of the *varṇa-sphoṭa* is to be reconciled with the different lengths assigned to different vowels in grammar.

(*p*. 3, *l*. 1) इदम्, the distinction of short, long etc. in vowels. — ' तपरस्तत्कालस्य इति ' : Here after this, some such words as सूत्रभाष्ये यदुक्तं तेन are to be understood. There (i. e. under P. 1. 1. 70) the problem which has cropped up in the *Mbh*. is this : If P. 1. 1. 70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य ultimately serves to ward off phonemes with a different duration, then a difficulty arises. Supposing Pāṇini has uttered a particular vowel in a particular speed (say *druta* ' fast '), then the operation taught for that vowel will not be applicable to it in a particular actual utterance if it is uttered in a different speed (say *madhyama* ' medium ', or *vilambita* ' slow ') because of the difference of duration (*kālabheda*) ; and consequently provision for such a contingency will have to be made. This objection

is ruled out there by saying that with whatever speed a speaker may utter phonemes, in accordance with his habit, the phonemes as such remain constant. The fast or slow utterance of a speaker does not affect the objective or intrinsic length of a phoneme (सिद्धं त्ववस्थिता वर्णा वक्तुश्चिराचिरवचनाद् वृत्तयो विशिष्यन्ते *Vār*. 5). In this connection Pat. says : स्फोटः शब्दः, ध्वनिः शब्दगुणः। ... स्फोटस्तावानेव भवति। ध्वनिकृता वृद्धिः। It is from this passage that Bhar. quotes स्फोटस्तावानेव। The words केवलं वृत्तिभेदः are his paraphrase of वृत्तयो विशिष्यन्ते.

The *Dīp*. now says that all the talk (in *Dīp*. 1. 8) about a short or a long vowel contradicts what the *Mbh*. has said under P. 1. 1. 70, viz. स्फोटस्तावानेव. How do you speak of a vowel of a shorter duration, and a vowel of a longer duration? (*p*. 3, *l*. 3) ततश्च सर्वासु वृत्तिषु ... भवितव्यमैस्भावेन। Bhar. now goes one further. If the intrinsic duration of a phoneme is the same in spite of the difference in *vṛtti*, then *a* and *ā*, for instance, will have to be regarded as of equal duration. And this will lead to undesirable situations. The rule P. 7. 1. 9 : *ato bhisa ais* e. g. will apply even to *ā*, since *ā* could then be comprehended by *a* and instead of *khaṭvābhiḥ* the wrong form **khaṭvaiḥ* will result.

Observation: This argument in the *Dīp*. is strange and difficult to follow. The *Mbh*. on P. 1. 1. 70 uses the word *vṛtti* definitely in the sense of speed or tempo of speech, i. e. it refers to the short or continued perception of a phoneme due to the fast or slow speech habit of a speaker; it does not refer to the length or intrinsic duration of a vowel which it says is fixed (*avasthita*). The *Mbh*. can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as stating that a short and a long vowel have the same duration. We must therefore understand that the objector here in the *Dīp*. either genuinely misunderstands or deliberately chooses to misunderstand the word *vṛtti* as denoting the derivational (*yaugika*) meaning, viz. duration in general, so applying to both the short and long vowels as well as to fast and slow speeds. Then only the objection can be understood. I may, however, mention at least one place where the word *vṛtti* is understood in these both kinds of duration. Vṛṣabha, while commenting on वृत्तिभेदं in the *Vāk*. I. 75, says : वृत्तिभेदो ह्रस्वत्वादिभेदः.

It is interesting to note that the *vṛtti* under the *Vāk*. I. 75 has raised the same objection by way of introducing I. 76. It says : यद्येवं ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतेष्वपि ध्वनिरेव कालभेदहेतुः ... इति दीर्घप्लुतयोर्यथैव वृत्तिभेदेऽपि तथैव तत्कालव्यपदेशप्रसङ्गः।

The passage (*ll*. 4–8) उच्यते। नैष दोषः। ... उपलब्धिकृत् इति। answers this objection.

It is to be noted that the objection was apparently taken on the understanding that *śabda* (say, a phoneme) is to be produced, while the reply is given on

the view of eternality of *śabda* (*nityatvābhyupagama*[1]). A phoneme being eternal, it is not to be produced. It is already there. It is only to be manifested. The physical sounds (*dhvani*) do not constitute the phoneme (*varṇa*), they are only manifestors of the eternal phonemes. The *dhvani*-s, further, are twofold, *prākṛta* 'primary' and *vaikṛta* 'secondary'. The *prākṛta dhvani*-s are responsible for the manifestation of a phoneme while the *vaikṛta dhvani*-s are responsible for the continued perception of the phoneme (which is already manifested by the *prākṛta dhvani*-s). Bhar. here does not say so specifically, but what he means is that the particular features like shortness and length, which are essential features of the phoneme, are determined by *prākṛta dhvani*-s. These features are erroneously imposed on the phoneme (in its *sphoṭa* aspect) and that is why even the science of grammar speaks of short or long vowels (in spite of their being timeless). The features like slowness or fastness, on the other hand, which are unessential, are due to the *vaikṛta dhvani*-s. They are not imposed on the phoneme in grammar. Read the following extract from the *Vāk.* I with relevant parts of the *Vṛtti.*

यद्येवं ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतेष्वपि ध्वनिरेव कालभेदहेतुः ··· दीर्घप्लुतयोर्यथैव वृत्तिभेदेऽपि तथैव तत्कालव्यपदेशप्रसङ्गः ... इत्येतस्मिन् पर्यनुयोगे प्रसक्ते प्रतिविधीयते —

स्वभावभेदान्नित्यत्वे ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतादिषु ।
प्राकृतस्य ध्वनेः कालः शब्दस्येत्युपचर्यते ॥ ७६ ॥

इह द्विविधो ध्वनिः प्राकृतो वैकृतश्च । तत्र प्राकृतो नाम येन विना स्फोटरूपमनभिव्यक्तं न परिच्छिद्यते । वैकृतस्तु येनाभिव्यक्तं स्फोटरूपं पुनःपुनरविच्छेदेन प्रचिततरं कालमुपलभ्यते। एवं हि संग्रहकारः पठति — 'शब्दस्य ग्रहणे हेतुः प्राकृतो ध्वनिरिष्यते। स्थितिभेदे निमित्तत्वं वैकृतः प्रतिपद्यते ॥' ... स्वभावभेदादपचितध्वनिद्योत्यो ह्रस्वः । तावताऽभिव्यक्तिनिमित्तेन स्वरूपस्य ग्राहिका बुद्धिस्तत्रोपपद्यते । प्रचितध्वनिद्योत्यस्तु दीर्घः । प्रचिततरध्वनिप्रतिपाद्यस्तु प्लुतः । स च प्राकृतध्वनिकालो व्यतिरेकाग्रहणादध्यारोप्यमाणः स्फोटे स्फोटकाल इत्युपचर्यते शास्त्रे ॥ ७६ ॥

शब्दस्योर्ध्वमभिव्यक्तेर्वृत्तिभेदं तु वैकृताः ।
ध्वनयः समुपोहन्ते स्फोटात्मा तैर्न भिद्यते ॥ ७७ ॥

... अभिव्यक्ते शब्दे ध्वनिरुत्तरकालमनुवर्तमानो बुद्ध्यनुवृत्तिं शब्दविषयां विषयाभिव्यक्तिबलाधानादुपसंहरति । तस्मादुपलक्षितव्यतिरेकेण वैकृतेन ध्वनिना संसृज्यमानोऽपि स्फोटात्मा ताद्रूप्यस्यानध्यारोपात् शास्त्रे ह्रस्वादिवत् कालभेदं नावतरति ॥ ७७ ॥ The upshot of the whole discussion in the *Dīp.* and the *Vāk.* (along with the *Vṛtti*) seems to be, that although in *Sphoṭa* as such there is no difference between short and long vowels (both being eternal), still the difference in their relative manifestors (*prākṛta dhvani*-s) is accepted in grammar. Their length is distintive. So no danger of P. 7. 1. 9: अतो भिस ऐस् applying to खट्वाभिः and producing a wrong form.

1. नित्यत्व stresses अभिव्यङ्ग्यत्व as against कार्यत्व.

(*p*. 3, *l*. 6) यः करण ··· तौ प्राकृतौ. Bhar. regards as *prākṛta* not only the sound produced by the activity of the speech organs, but also a subsequent one produced (on the *vīcītaraṅga* maxim) by this sound. They are called primary because they are distinctive (ताभ्यां विशेषोपलब्धिः). The others are called secondary, because they are not distinctive. विशेष is practically the same thing as स्वरूप.

The punctuation and some readings in ताभ्यां विशेषो ... एष विशेषः are not free from doubt. The MS. reads : ताभ्यां विशेषोपलब्धिः यस्तु ध्वतो ध्वनिरुत्पद्यते स वैकृता ततो विशेषाभावात् केवल तु स एवमुपलब्धकृत् इति। एष विशेषो यदि... AL read this as : ताभ्यां विशेषोपलाब्धिः। यस्तु ध्वनितो ध्वनिरुत्पद्यते स वैकृतः ततो विशेषाभावात्। केवलं तु स एवमुपलब्धो वैकृत इति एष विशेषः। यदि ... Sw, on the other hand, reads as : ताभ्यां विशेषोपलब्धिः। यस्तु ध्वनेर्ध्वनिरुत्पद्यते स वैकृतः ततो विशेषाभावात्, केवलं तु स एवमुपलब्ध-कृत(?) इति। एष विशेषः — यदि ... I have emended MS °षोपलब्धिः to °ब्धेः on the basis of the Abl. °षाभावात् which follows. I further take it that Bhar. regards विशेषोप-लब्धि and its absence as the reason why the sounds are called *prākṛta* and *vaikṛta* respectively. With Sw I take the final एष विशेषः as going with what follows.

(*p*. 3, *l*. 8) यदि [दीर्घप्लुतेषु] ... त्तुपरमात् is rather a peculiar passage. If I have understood it correctly, here Bhar. seems to be adding a note of dissent to what Pat. has said. Bhar. however simply mentions it, without being very dogmatic about it. He says, firstly, that if short, long and prolated vowels (e. g *i*, *ī* and *ī* 3) are theoretically looked upon as identical[1] (*śabdāntarābhāvād*) and consequently to account for their apparent difference from one another difference of duration (*bhinnakālatvam*) is accepted, then, by the same reasoning, you will have to accept difference of duration in the case of slow and fast utterances of vowels also (which is denied in the *Mbh.*). Secondly, if it is held, that the articulator strikes against the point of articulation repeatedly in the case of fast speed as well as in the case of long and prolated vowels, then it will be d fficult to justify the *Mbh.* statement : बाह्यश्च पुनरास्यात् कालः. This observation has to be evidently understood as made ignoring the नाभिप्रदेशे आक्षेपविशेषः said just above, and accepting करणसंनिपात as alone deciding externalness and internalness.— The MS तदुतादिष्ववसति is read as तद् द्रुतादिष्वसति, and [बा]ह्यत्वं as बाह्यत्वे by Sw. I follow AL.

[1. 9]

This section of the *Dīp.* discusses the question whether *a* is already pronounced open by Pāṇini, and Kāt. is merely explaining its purpose, or whether the suggestion of the open pronunciation is comining for the first time from Kāt.

---

1. Cf. the *Vār*. (5) एकत्वादकारस्य सिद्धम्।

himself. The full text of the *Mbh.* here runs as follows : किं पुनरिदं विवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य प्रयोजनमन्वाख्यायते आहोस्वित् संवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य विवृतोपदेशश्चोद्यते ? Here सूत्रकारेण[1] is to be supplied as the subject of उपदिश्यमानस्य in both places and कात्यायनेन or वार्त्तिककारेण as that of अन्वाख्यायते and चोद्यते. In explaining the alternatives stated in the *Mbh.*, Bhar. unnecessarily reverses their order. Kaiy. as usual, is more systematic and clearer : किं सूत्रकारेणैव[1] विवृतोपदेशः कृतो वार्त्तिककारेण तु तस्य प्रयोजनमुक्तम्, अथ वाऽकृत एव विवृतोपदेशो वार्त्तिककारेण कर्तव्यत्वेनोपन्यस्त इति प्रश्नः ।

(*p.* 3, *l.* 13) यदयम् 'अ अ' ... शास्ति. The full text of the *Mbh.* is as follows : विवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य प्रयोजनमन्वाख्यायते । कथं ज्ञायते ? यदयम् 'अ अ' इत्यकारस्य विवृतस्य संवृततापत्यापत्तिं शास्ति । The Sū. *a a* (P. 8. 4. 68) is explained as teaching the reversion of the *vivṛta a* to *saṁvṛta a*. Read the *Kāś.* : एकोऽत्र विवृतः, अपरः संवृतः । तत्र विवृतस्य संवृतः क्रियते । अकारो विवृतः संवृतो भवति । वृक्षः । प्लक्षः । इह शास्त्रे कार्यार्थमकारो विवृतः प्रतिज्ञातः, तस्य तथाभूतस्यैव प्रयोगो मा भूदिति संवृतप्रत्यापत्तिरियं क्रियते । The *Dīp.* यदीह ... विवृतोऽकार इति makes explicit the argument of the *Mbh.* (Cf. Kaiy. : तत्र प्रत्यापत्त्या पूर्वः पक्ष आश्रितः । अन्यथा शास्त्रान्ते प्रत्यापत्तिवचनमनर्थकं स्यात्, स्वरूपप्रच्यवाभावात्). The *Dīp.* further adds (not done so here expressly by Kaiy.) that *a* occurring not only in the Pratyāhāra Sū. but also in *Aṣṭ.* sūtras like *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32), *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101) and in actual words of the language like *aśva* etc., is *vivṛta* in the formative stage.

(*p.* 3, *l.* 17) अस्ति ह्यन्य ... प्रयोजनम् । The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is thus : नैतदस्ति ज्ञापकम् । अस्ति ह्यन्यदेतस्य वचने प्रयोजनम् । किम् ? अतिखट्वः अतिमालः इत्यत्रान्तर्यतो विवृतस्य विवृतः प्राप्नोति, संवृतः स्यादित्येवमर्था प्रत्यापत्तिः । This *Mbh.* says that the reversion taught in P. 8. 4. 68 does not necessarily presuppose that *a* in the Śiva-sūtra is read as *vivṛta* by P. There is equally another possibility. That Sū. (P. 8. 4. 68) may have concrete word forms like अतिखट्वः in mind. The compounds अतिखट्वः, अतिमालः result from the basic expressions अतिक्रान्तः खट्वाम् and अतिक्रान्तः मालाम् respectively. In the process the final *ā* is shortened (P. 1. 2. 48 : गोस्त्रियोरुपसर्जनस्य). This *a* coming in the place of *ā* will tend to be *vivṛta* as being closest to be the original *ā*. Pāṇini frames 8. 4. 68 to prevent this. So that rule does not necessarily prove that *a* in *aiuṇ* is read as *vivṛta* by Pāṇini. The *Dīp.* अयमभिप्रायः etc. explains this argument. It says that *a a* better refers to *a* in words like *atikhaṭvaḥ*, which are meaningful, than to *a* in the Śiva-sūtras which are meaningless. (This statement is evidently based on the Pari. 14 : अर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्य.) संस्कारशब्दः, a linguistic element belonging to grammar, as against प्रयोगशब्दः, one belonging to the linguistic usage. — प्रतिपादकशब्द, a grammatical element, component of a finished form. The MS

1. By सूत्रकारेण (in Kaiy.) Nāg. however understands महेश्वर or वेदपुरुष. The *chāya* prefers the latter as being the सिद्धान्त.

actually reads प्रतिपादनशब्दानां, still I follow AL and emend it to °पादक° as that is more proper. It also occurs in the *Vāk.* I. 24 in contrast with an अन्वाख्येय word : अन्वाख्येयाश्च ये शब्दा ये चापि प्रतिपादकाः ।

(*p.* 3, *l.* 19) अयं च ... तस्मात् प्रत्यापत्तिरुच्यते। The protagonist of *anyat prayojanam* (viz. *atikhatvah* etc.) finishes his argument here : The close pronunciation of *a*, though a fault, is there. It owes to the carelessness of a speaker. AL read the text here as अयं न वक्तृप्रमादजो दोषः अस्त्येव विवृतत्वम्। But the letter in the MS looks more like च, than like न. Secondly, this contradicts the *Dīp.* itself (*p.* 1, *ll* 5–6). So I follow Sw, with whose reading I agree. — Another proof (आतश्च) for it is that Pāṇini himself has so pronounced *a* in his rule 8. 4. 68; in *a a* the first one is *vivṛta* which is replaced by the second one which is *saṁvṛta* (cf. the *Sid-Kau.*: विवृतमनूद्य संवृतोऽनेन विधीयते।). Since a *vivṛta a* is not an impossibility, it will force itself in words like *atikhaṭvaḥ*. Hence P. 8. 4. 68 (तस्मात् प्रत्यापत्तिरुच्यते).

(*p.* 3, *l.* 22) अथ च न ... कस्य प्रत्यापत्तिः ? An objection against the *anyat prayojanam* view. Let us suppose that Pāṇini does not read *a* as *vivṛta* in the Śivasū. Let us also further suppose that Pāṇini does not read *a* in his rules like *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32) as *vivṛta*. So now *a* has its usual *saṁvṛta* everywhere. The vowel *ā*, on the other hand, is *vivṛta*. Since *ā* is not included in the Śivasūtras between *a* and *c*, it cannot be called *ac*. P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः also cannot confer the status of *ac* on *ā* for want of *sāvarṇya* : *a* is now *saṁvṛta* while *ā* is *vivṛta* and so is not homogeneous of *a*. Now let us go further. P. 1. 2. 48 teaches a short substitute for *go* etc. when *go* etc. is subordinate. So *ā* of *khaṭvā* is expected to be replaced by *a* in the compound *atikhaṭvaḥ*. But how is it now possible ? For, a rule which teaches a short or a long vowel as substitute (like P. 1. 2. 48) operates only if the original element to be replaced is *ac* (cf. P. 1. 2. 28 : अचश्च = ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतशब्दैर्यत्राज् विधीयते तत्र अच इति षष्ठ्यन्तं पदमुपतिष्ठते। सि.कौ.) and also if the substitute is *ac* (P. 1. 2. 27 : ऊकालोऽज्झ्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः). In the present case (*atikhaṭvaḥ*) neither the original vowel (i. e. *ā*) nor the expected substitute (a *vivṛta a*) is *ac* (असावर्ण्यादग्रहणे सति स्थान्यादेशयोरच्त्वाभावः). How can then there be any substitution at all ? And if a *vivṛta a* cannot threaten to force itself, where is the need for the rule *a a* to dislodge it ?

(*p.* 3, *l.* 24) तदादेशः, i. e. a *vivṛta a* which, it is feared, will replace *ā*. — It is strange that an important word like *na* should be missing and so should be required to be supplied. Similarly the following word *ac*. Cf. Kaiy. for this objection : नन्विहासति विवृतोपदेशे सावर्ण्याभावादकारेणाकारस्याग्रहणादच्त्वाभावात् कथम् अतिखट्व इत्यत्र ह्रस्वः ?

(*p*. 3, *l*. 25) The passage उच्यते। लिङ्गाद् ... यकपूर्वं आ answers the objection. It points out that Pāṇini's express mention (in 7. 3. 46) of '*a* which has taken the place of *ā*' is sufficiently indicative (*liṅga*) that *ā* (whether deemed *ac* or not) *is* replaced by *a* where shortening is taught. The rule उदीचामातः स्थाने यकपूर्वायाः (P. 7. 3. 46) says that according to the Northern grammarians *a*, which has come into the place of *ā* which precedes *y* or *k*, is replaced by *i*. As a result we get fem. forms like क्षत्रियिका, चटकिका etc. (from *क्षत्रिय-का, *चटक-का < *क्षत्रिया-का, *चटका-का) with a suffix *ka* which is diminutive or, conveys some such meaning. It is further pointed out the *a* comes into the place of *ā* (*क्षत्रियाका >*क्षत्रियका) only as a result of shortening taught in P. 7. 4. 13: केऽणः; there is no other possibility. The passage यस्माल्लिङ्गात् ... यकपूर्वं आ is not clear to me.

(*p*. 4, *l*. 1) यद्येवम् ... प्रत्यापत्त्या वा contains a question put to the opponent who has argued above on the basis of indication (*liṅga*). If at all indication is to be resorted to, why not say that *sāvarṇya* (between *a* and *ā*) itself, inspite of their difference in articulation, is indicated by the indicatory Sū. 7. 3. 46? Then the assuming of *vivṛta* for *a* becomes unnesessary, and, what is more, it will also spare the *pratyāpatti*. — The *Dīp*. उच्यते। लिङ्ग ... सावर्ण्यमिति answers this question. The scope of inference on the basis of *liṅga* is limited. One cannot go beyond what a *liṅga* can legitimately indicate. If Pāṇini mentions $a < \bar{a}$ in a particular context, all that one can deduce from this is that *a* does replace *ā* in that environment, notwithstanding any difficulty that would normally arise. But that is all. The *liṅga* is not empowered to grant *sāvarṇya*.

(*p*. 4, *l*. 4) अथ वा...सावर्ण्यमिति। Another argument, showing how only the substitution of *a* in the place of *ā*, and not *sāvarṇya* also, can be had on the basis of *liṅga*. In the rule गोस्त्रियोरुपसर्जनस्य (P. 1. 2. 48) Pāṇini mentions feminine stems (*strī*) as undergoing a shortening when they undergo a subordinate position. If here *a* cannot replace their final *ā*, the reading of *strī* in that rule will be futile. It will have no scope. To avoid such an eventuality one can assume that substitution does somehow take place. But this is not sufficient to warrant the *sāvarṇya*.

Readings : (1) (*p*. 3, *l*. 19) For the MS च न(or व)क्तृ-, AL read न वक्तृ- and Sw च वक्तृ-. Sw's text goes against the tenor of the argument that *vivṛta* is *not* just a faulty pronunciation due to carelessness. — (2) (*p*. 3, *l*. 24) Here the MS simply reads स्थानी नाप्यादेश. AL supply a न before स्थानी while Sw reads (न) स्थानी (अच्) नाप्यादेश. I follow the latter. — (3) (*p*. 4, *l*. 1) The MS आपद्य° is reconstructed as आत्। यद्ये° by AL and as आ(प्)। (य)द्ये° by Sw. Our reconstruction आ। यद्ये is the simplest.—(4) (*p*. 4, *ll*. 4–5) The MS गौणाद् ग्रहणं (in both places) is read, in the first occurrence as गोटाङ्ग्र° by AL,

and emended into गोस्त्रीग्र° by Sw. The latter is certainly a happy emendation and is followed here. In the second occurrence, for the MS ... णाद् ग्रहणं, AL read टाङ्ग्रहणं, Sw (गो)स्त्रीग्रहणं. The context requires only स्त्रीग्रहणं. We do not know what were the two letters in the original MS, for which a gap is shown in our MS.

(*p.* 4, *l.* 6) त(? अ)त्रान्तर्यत इति. For the full text of the *Mbh.* here, see Notes above (on *p.* 3, *l.* 17). There the *Mbh.* points out that owing to affinity (*āntaryataḥ*) the *a* which will replace *ā* in forming *atikhaṭvaḥ* from *atikrāntaḥ khaṭvām* will necesarily have to be *vivṛta*. — वक्तु: प्रमादजोऽस्त्यन्तरतम इत्यभिप्राय:। This is *Dīp.*'s comment on the *Mbh.* आन्तर्यतो विवृतस्य विवृत: प्राप्नोति. The MS of the *Dīp.* is corrupt here. It reads वकु प्रमादजोस्तारतम. We can of course read (i) a *visarga* after वक्तु and (2) स्त्य for स्ता and (3) supply न्त between स्त्य and र, thus arriving at वक्तु: प्रमादजोऽस्त्यन्तरतम. — (*p.* 4, *l.* 7) नैव लोके न च वेदे। The full text of this *Mbh.* is as follows : नैतदस्ति। नैव लोके न च वेदेऽकारो विवृतोऽस्ति। कस्तर्हि ? संवृत:। योऽस्ति स भविष्यति। Pat. here means to say that there is no *vivṛta a* in the language of the cultured (*śiṣṭaprayoga*). So there is no possibility of such an *a* replacing *ā* in the formation of the word *atikhaṭvaḥ*. Pāṇini cannot reasonably be supposed to have framed his *pratyāpatti* rule for averting such a non-entity. — Bhar. does not directly comment on this *Mbh.* But he takes the *Mbh.* as a reply to another aspect of the objection which he himself has raised above in the *Dīp.* The *vivṛta a* may not be there in the language of the cultured. But it was pointed out above that as a faulty pronunciation due to carelessness of the speaker it does exist. (And even Pāṇini has once so pronounced *a* in his *pratyāpatti* rule !) To prevent it in *atikhaṭvaḥ* etc. Pāṇini framed his *pratyāpatti* rule. In the *Dīp.* एतदुक्तं भवति ... लिङ्गं प्रत्यापत्ति: Bhar. says that this objection also can be taken as refuted by this *Mbh.* Granting that the *vivṛta* pronunciation of *a* due to carelessness of *a* does exist, you do not require a Pāṇinian sūtra to rectify it. There are many other defects of pronunciation like *kala* etc. They have been enumerated in the Āhnika I, and the *Mbh* has made it clear that those faults of pronunciation can be rectified on the strength of lists like *gargādi* and *bidādi*. (Read : 'आकृत्युपदेशात् सिद्धमिति चेत् संवृतादीनां प्रतिषेध:' (वा. १८)। ... नैष दोष:। गर्गादिबिदादिपाठात् संवृतादीनां निवृत्तिर्भविष्यति। अस्त्यन्यद् गर्गादिबिदादिपाठे प्रयोजनम्। किम् ? समुदायानां साधुत्वं यथा स्यादिति। ... एवं तर्ह्युभयमनेन क्रियते — पाठश्चैव विशेष्यते, कलादयश्च निवर्त्यन्ते। *Mbh.* I. 14. 21–15. 11). And surely *vivṛta* cannot be regarded as a more serious defect than *kala* or *saṁvṛta* so as to warrant a special *pratyāpatti* rule in the *Aṣṭ.* Consequently the present *pratyāpatti* rule (P. 8. 4. 68) must be regarded as an indication of the *vivṛta* pronunciation of *a* in the Śiva-Sū. to revert which Pāṇini frames his *pratyāpatti* rule. — On how the *gargādi bidādi* lists can help in removing the faults of pronunciation, Nāg. remarks : संवृतादिदोषरहितानामेव तत्र पाठादिति भाव:।

(*p.* 4, *l.* 7) The plural in भवतोक्ता दोषाः वक्तृप्रमादजाः सन्ति is unintelligible, since all along the talk has been about a single fault viz. *vivṛta*. The MS भयाक्तो is read as भावत्का by AL and as मयोक्ता by Sw. I read it as भवतोक्ता. Further, though no previous ed. supplies it, the context certainly requires a negative particle *na* going with *vaktavyā*. So I have supplied it. The MS तावता is emended into तावतां (going with दोषाणाम्) by Sw. I have followed it tentatively. Still तेषाम् was expected.

(*p.* 4, *l.* 11) कः पुनरत्र विशेष इति। The full text of this *Mbh.* is as follows : कः पुनरत्र विशेषः, विवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य प्रयोजनमन्वाख्यायेत, संवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य वा विवृतोपदेशश्चोद्येतेति ? The *Mbh.* seems to say : So it is certain that *a* in the Śiva-sū. has to be *vivṛta*. It is also certain that the *Vār.* requires a predicate. What does it matter if one supplies *kṛtaḥ* or *kartavyaḥ* ? It is immaterial. Some predicate has to be supplied. Why quarrel whether it should be *kṛtaḥ* or *kartavyaḥ* ?

So the question raised here merely concerns the grammatical construction or interpretation (वाक्यगतं व्यापारं पृच्छति as Bhar. says). Factually it *does* make a difference : to say that Pāṇini read *a* as *vivṛta* and Kāt. is merely explaining the purpose behind it is one thing, and to say that Pāṇini read it as *saṁvṛta* and Kātyāyana is urging that it should be *vivṛta* is an entirely different thing (नन्वाद्यपक्षे प्रयोजनान्वाख्यानमात्रपरत्वम्, द्वितीये विवृतोपदेशपरत्वमपि ... as Nāg. says). Kaiy. practically repeats Bhar. : 'विवृतोपदेशः' इत्यत्र 'कृतः' इति वा 'कर्तव्यः' इति वा वाक्यशेषाध्याहारे न कश्चिद् विशेष इत्यर्थः।

(*p.* 4, *l.* 13) न खलु ... आहोपुरुषिकामात्रं तु। This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : न खलु कश्चिद् विशेषः। आहोपुरुषिकामात्रं तु भवानाह — संवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य विवृतोपदेशश्चोद्यते। वयं तु ब्रूमः — विवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य प्रयोजनमन्वाख्यायते। From the way Bhar. chooses his *pratīka* (which ends in °मात्रं तु) and from his interpretation of आहोपुरुषिका (= अहंयुत्वम् 'self-conceipt'), one is inclined to take the *Mbh.* आहोपुरुषिकामात्रं as a nominal expression (which would go with both the conflicting views) and a sentence complete in itself. But the tenor of the *Dīp* which takes it that the *pratyāpatti* sūtra has clearly indicated the Pāṇini himself read *a* as *vivṛta*, shows that the opponent's view (संवृतस्योपदिश्यमानस्य विवृतोपदेशश्चोद्यते) alone results out of his sheer self-conceipt (न सम्यग्भवतोक्तम्, मयैव तु यदुक्तं तदेव युक्तं प्रत्यापत्तिवचनात्।). Consequently. In the *Mbh.* आहोपुरुषिकामात्रं has to be taken adverbially. It goes only with भवानाह etc.

आहोपुरुषिका — based on अहोपुरुषः. Bhar. apparently seems to derive this compound from अहं पुरुषः! (with the suggestion that अहं is replaced by अहो). Kaiy. simply says : अहो अहं पुरुषः इत्यहंकारवान्. Nāg. explicitly says that अहो means अहम्. Read : अहो इति अहमित्यर्थे। He also says : मयूरव्यंसकादित्वात् समासः।

— Although Bhar. says: मनोज्ञादिदर्शनाद् वुञ् (and Kaiy. मनोज्ञादित्वात् वुञ्), the word अहोपुरुष is not seen in the *manojñādi* list of any grammar (Birwé, der Gaṇapāṭha zu den Adhyāyas iv und v der Grammatik Pāṇinis, p. 344). Evidently *manojñādi* was taken as an *ākṛtigaṇa*.[1]

[1. 10]

This section discusses the topic viz. whether with *a* declared open in the Śiva-sū., it is consequently necessary to declare *a* in the actual linguistic elements like roots, nominal stems etc. also open.

तस्य विवृतोपदेशात् is a part of the *Vār*. 2 which, along with *Mbh*. accompanying it, runs as follows: 'तस्य विवृतोपदेशादन्यत्रापि विवृतोपदेशः (वा. 2)'। तस्यैतस्याक्षरसमाम्नायिकस्य विवृतोपदेशादन्यत्रापि विवृतोपदेशः कर्तव्यः। क्वान्यत्र? धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययनिपातस्थस्य। किं प्रयोजनम्? सवर्णग्रहणार्थः। आक्षरसमाम्नायिकेनास्य ग्रहणं यथा स्यात्। किं च कारणं न स्यात्? विवारभेदादेव। The Vārttikakāra here says that the *vivṛta a* of the grammatical system cannot comprehend the *saṁvṛta a* of roots etc. If the roots etc. are to undergo operations based upon the *ac*-status of their *a*, that *a* also must be declared to be *vivṛta*. Merely declaring *a* of the Śiva-sū. open does not suffice.

Here initially a question arises thus: a sound in the *akṣarasamāmnāya* (Śiva-sū.), say *a*, is not a sound in isolation. It is supposed to stand for all *a* sounds in the actual language. Consequently, when *a* in the Śiva-sū., a representative of the totality of *a* sounds, is declared *vivṛta*, all *a* sounds in the language are as good as declared to be *vivṛta*. Where is then the need to make a fresh declaration of their *vivṛta* nature? Kaiy. voices this question thus: ननु च सर्वेषामकाराणां यत् सामान्यं तदनुकरणमत्राकारः। तस्य च विवृतत्वे प्रतिज्ञायमाने सर्वेषां तत् प्रतिज्ञातं भवतीति किमुच्यते 'तस्य विवृतोपदेशात् ...' इति? Nāg. says that one who holds the view expressed in the *Vār*. is to be supposed to be ignorant of the fact that *pratyāpatti* presupposes *a* to be *vivṛta* everywhere: प्रत्यापत्त्या अइउण् इत्यत्रैव प्रक्रियादशायां सर्वत्राकारो विवृतः प्रतिज्ञात इत्यजानन् शङ्कते — भाष्ये तस्य विवृतोपदेशादिति।

Bhar. tries to furnish two arguments justifying the *Vār*. The *Dīp*. आक्षरसमाम्नायिकः ... प्रतिपाद्यते contains the first argument. According to it, *a* in the *akṣarasamāmnāya* is not *anukaraṇa* 'an imitative name' of *a* in the actual languge. It denotes just itself, the *svarūpa*; it does not stand for any external thing, like the concrete *a* sounds of the language. The openness of *a* in the language being thus undeclared so far, it has to be done, as the *Vār*. says.

1. An editorial foot-note in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, Tara Publications, Varanasi, 1967, on P. 5. 1. 133 says: बहुल, अवश्य, अहोपुरुष – एते शब्दा अत्र गणेऽधिकाः कुत्रचित्।

Bhar.'s point regarding the *a* of the Śiva-sū. denoting itself needs some explanation. He has expounded this view in the *Vāk.* also, according to which a word uttered in grammar does not itself undergo the operation concerned. The uttered word only creates a mental image (*buddhistha*) of it, a word similar to it, in the listner. That is, so to say, its first meaning. It does not do anything more than that. As an illustration, Bhar. says that *ṭ* of the tense name *laṭ* is *it*; but this *it*-status belongs to the *ṭ* of the other word *laṭ* understood by the listner in his mind. The uttered (*uccāriata*) word is merely *pratipādaka*; the understood (mental) word is the *pratipādya*, and the recipient of the operation. Similarly in the present case also. The *vivṛta a* of the Śiva-sū will convey only itself as possessed of the *vivṛta* status. It cannot denote the actual *a* of the language which will continue to be *saṁvṛta*.

Cf. the *Vākyapadīya* I. 61–62:

> यो य उच्चार्यते शब्दो नियतं न स कार्यभाक् ।
> अन्यप्रत्यायने शक्तिर्न तस्य प्रतिबध्यते ॥
> उच्चरन् परतन्त्रत्वाद् गुणः कार्यैर्न युज्यते ।
> तस्मात् तदर्थैः कार्याणां संबन्धः परिकल्प्यते ॥

(*p.* 4, *l.* 21) अथ चानुकरणो ... स्यादिति justifies the *Vār.* even on the *anukaraṇa* view. If one accepted the generic view (*ākṛtipakṣa*) of phonemes, then there is no difficuly. The *a* of the Śiva-sū. will be representative of the whole class of *a*-sounds. But if one subscribed to the individualistic view (*vyaktipakṣa*), then the *a* of the Śiva-sū. would represent only one particular *a* and nothing more. The vast majority of *a*-sounds in the language will remain unrepresented by the *vivṛta a* of the Śiva-sū. Hence the necessity of the fresh declaration. — समुदाय (in समुदायस्थानां), a (meaningful) combination (of phonemes), i. e. a verbal root, a nominal stem etc. Since there is to be only one *anukārya*, the plural in समुदायस्थानां [अकाराणाम्] is not intelligible. But we may better supply अनुकार्यत्वेन अभिप्रेतानाम् अकाराणाम्, in which case there is no difficulty. द्रव्यवच्चोपदेशे = व्यक्तिपक्षे. — Kaiy. summerizes these two arguments in favour of the *Vār.* in just one small sentence : एवं तर्हि यदा कस्यचिदेवाकारस्येदमनुकरणम्, स्वरूपपदार्थको वाऽकारस्तदेदमुच्यत इत्यदोषः ।

(*p.* 4, *l.* 23) In इतरथा हि प्रयत्नभेदात् ... स्वरो न स्यात् the *Dīp.* points out four different kinds of cases (*dhātu-prātipadika-pratyaya-nipāta* as mentioned in the *Vār.*) where the *a* in roots etc. being *saṁvṛta* will not be homogeneous with the *vivṛta a* of the system; consequently it will not be comprehended by or included in the *a* uttered in the rules for some operation; finally the operations, though desired, will not be available. The main point to be remembered in this connection is that all the operations here concerned are of the nature of substi-

tution, where either the *sthānin* has to have the status of *ac* in order to undergo them; or *ac* constitutes the condition for the operation. They are:

(1) Lengthening of *a* in the root *śam* e. g. (P. 7. 3. 74 : शमामष्टानां दीर्घः श्यनि). According to P. 1. 2. 28, only an *ac* can undergo lengthening.

(2) Substitution of an Udātta *a* for the last among the vowels of a nominal stem such as *dṛṣád* (*Phiṭ-sū*. 1. 1 : फिषोऽन्त उदात्तः). The tones *udātta* etc. belong only to what is an *ac*.

(3) The substitution of *āy* in the place of *ai* of *cai*, the Vṛddhi form of the root *ci*, when the suffix *ṇvul* = *aka* follows (P. 6. 1. 78 : एचोऽयवायावः). Here *aci* 'when an *ac* follows' is the condition.

(4) The high pitch of the initial *a* of the prefix *ava* in forms like *avagata* cannot be accounted for (by the *Phiṭ*-sū. 4. 12 : निपाता आद्युदात्ताः), for the same difficulty as in the example No. 2 above.

(*p*. 4, *l*. 26) यदयम् 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः ...' इति । This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति — भवत्याक्षरसमाम्नायिकेन धात्वादिस्थस्य ग्रहणमिति यदयम् 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' इति प्रत्याहारेऽको ग्रहणं करोति । कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम् ? न हि द्वयोराक्षरसमाम्नायिकयोर्युगपत् समवस्थानमस्ति ।

This contains reply to the argument of the ***Vār***. It is based on a *jñāpaka*. The wording *akaḥ* (in P. 6. 1. 101) indicates that inspite of *prayatnabheda* (and the resulting absence of homogeneity), the *saṁvṛta a* of roots etc. will be comprehended by the *vivṛta a* of the grammar. When Pāṇini teaches a *savarṇadīrgha* Saṁdhi, he uses the Pratyāhāra *ak* (= *a, i, u, ṛ, ḷ*). The combinations like *a* + *a*, *i* + *i* result into *ā*, *ī* etc. (e. g. *daṇḍa* + *agra* = *daṇḍāgra*). If the rule were not to apply to cases like *daṇḍa* + *agra* for want of ***sāvarṇya***, what is the use of saying *akaḥ* 'in the place of *a, i, u, ṛ, ḷ*' in the rule? In that case Pāṇini would have said *ikaḥ* 'in the place of *i, u, ṛ, ḷ*'. Still he says *akaḥ*. This indicates that absence of homogeneity is no bar here.

(*p*. 4, *l*. 26) अयमनुबन्धेन ... When Pāṇini uses *akaḥ*, i. e. *a* with the code-letter *k*, you recognize it as the same as — rather, an *anukaraṇa* of — the *a* which is in the Śiva-sū. (and therefore *vivṛta*). But the other *a* evidently is not *ākṣarasamāmnāyika*, and so not *vivṛta*. Still Pāṇini teaches a long homogeneous sound as the substitute for both. This is a clue. Absence of homogeneity does not matter. The suggestion made in the *Vār*. is redundant. — न हि द्वयोराक्षर ... There is only one *ākṣarasamāmnāyika a*, whereas for the *savarṇadīrgha* Saṁdhi you require two. Where will you get the second *vivṛta a*? The rule won't work and Pāṇini, knowing this, would have said *ikaḥ* (instead of *akaḥ*). — यद्यपि एकोऽपि नास्ति ... Bhar. says that, really speaking, not even a

single *vivṛta a* will be available for the working of the rule. For, the *ākṣara-samāmnāyika a*, which alone we definitely know to be *vivṛta* will remain in the *Akṣarasamāmnāya*. On the individualistic theory, every *a* in the actual example is bound to be different from every other *a*, and so from the *a* of the *akṣarasamāmnāya* also. If the disputant said द्वयोराक्षरसमाम्नायिकयोः, it was simply because a Saṁdhi requires two sounds. That's all.

Kaiy. follows Bhar.: यदयमिति । अत्र हि ककारेण चिह्नेन प्रत्याहारस्थो विवृतो निर्दिष्टः, तेन च संवृतस्याग्रहणे *इकः सवर्णे इति वक्तव्यम् । न हि द्वयोरिति । यद्यप्येकोऽपि विवृतो नास्ति, तथापि ह्यधिष्ठानत्वादेकादेशस्य तथोक्तम् । Commenting on the *Prad.* यद्यप्येकोऽपि Nāg. observes succinctly : प्रत्युच्चारणं वर्णान्यत्वादाक्षरसमाम्नायिकस्य प्रयोगेऽभावादिति भावः । He also points out that the word प्रयोगे is to be supplied in the *Mbh.* before युगपत्समवस्थानम् (Read : अस्य 'प्रयोगे' इत्यादिः ।)

(*p.* 5. *l.* 2) तदर्थम् । This single word quoted from the *Mbh.* by Bhar. stands for the following *Mbh.* : नैतदस्ति ज्ञापकम् । अस्ति ह्यन्यदेतस्य वचने प्रयोजनम् । किम् ? यस्य आक्षरसमाम्नायिकेन ग्रहणमस्ति, तदर्थमेतत् स्यात् — खट्वाढकं मालाढकमिति । सति प्रयोजने न ज्ञापकं भवति । तस्माद्विवृतोपदेशः कर्तव्यः । This *Mbh.* refutes the *jñāpaka* given above. This is what is meant : Something becomes a *jñāpaka* only when it cannot be otherwise explained. If a reasonable purpose for it can be pointed out, then it cannot be regarded as superfluous, and consequently cannot be taken as a *jñāpaka*. If Pāṇini says *akaḥ* (instead of *ikaḥ*) it is meant for cases like *khaṭvā* + *āḍhaka* where both *ā*-s being *vivṛta* are homogeneous with *a* (read as *vivṛta* in the Śiva-sū.). Thus both being *ak*, P. 6. 1. 101 can apply and we have *ā* as a single substitute for both. Thus the wording *akaḥ* is useful; it is not superfluous, and so the argument आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति, भवत्याक्षरसमाम्नायिकेन धात्वादिस्थस्य ग्रहणं यदयम् 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' इति प्रत्याहारेऽको ग्रहणं करोति is not correct.

(*p.* 5. *l.* 2) क एष यत्नश्चोद्यते विवृतोपदेशो नाम । This is followed in the *Mbh.* by विवृतो वोपदिश्येत, संवृतो वा । को ह्यत्र विशेषः ? This is the point : Roots etc. have to be read. They have also to be read with *some* mode of articulation. If *vivṛta* is useful, let the roots etc. be read as *vivṛta*. It does not lead to any *gaurava*. The purpose will be automatically served. Where is then the need of a universal *declaration* like the one proposed in the *Vār.*? Why this special insistence (आदरः) on it ? — The words संवारेण, विवारेण are equivalent to संवृतेन, विवृतेन respectively.

(*p.* 5, *l.* 5) यान्येतानि प्रातिपदिकान्यग्रहणानि । This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : स एष सर्व एवमर्थो यत्नः क्रियते — यान्येतानि प्रातिपदिकान्यग्रहणानि तेषामेतेनाभ्युपायेनोपदेशश्चोद्यते । तद् गुरु भवति । तस्माद्वक्तव्यम् 'धात्वादिस्थश्च विवृतः' इति । The *Dīp.* य एते रङ्कादयः etc. explains this *Mbh.* Words like *raṅka* do not occur in

any *gaṇa* or in the *Aṣṭ*. So there is no occasion to demonstrate their *vivṛta*. (Note that Bhar. does not use प्रतिज्ञातुम् in its technical sense. It is equivalent to उपदेष्टुम् 'to show the *vivṛta* by an actual pronunciation'. This slackness of expression is regrettable.) — (तद्) गुरु भवति : Actually reading (with *vivṛta*) all the words like *raṅka* means a lot of prolixity. Hence the need for a universal declaration that *a* in all linguistic elements like verbal roots be regarded as *vivṛta* — Kaiy. summarises thus : प्रतिपदपाठस्याशक्यत्वात् 'तस्य विवृतोपदेशात्' इत्यनेन सर्वस्याकारस्य विवृतोपदेशः कार्यतया चोद्यते ।

Bhar. makes it clear that roots etc. will continue to be read as *saṁvṛta*, only, as far as operations are concerned, they will be considered to have a *vivṛta a*. Cf. Kaiy. : अग्रहणप्रातिपदिकार्थे विवृतत्वेऽवश्यचोदनीये धात्वादिस्थस्यापि संवृतस्यैव पठितस्य कार्यार्थं विवृतत्वं प्रतिज्ञेयम् । Nāg. observes : एवं च धात्वादिस्थश्च कार्यं लभत इत्यतिदेशोऽयमिति भावः । — After °चारयिष्यन्ते, the MS reads : आक्षरसमाम्नायिकस्येव विवृतोपदेशे प्रयोगे हेतुमाह । न हि शिष्टाः दीर्घप्लुतौ which is bracketed; also dropped in earlier eds., probably because of its irrelevance here. The translation of the last line including my emendation °विगमो is tentative.

Readings and Punctuation: (1) (*p*. 4, *l*. 18) Following Sw I emend MS तस्मात् (retained by AL) into तस्य so as to make it agree with the reading of the *Vār*. — (2) (*p*. 4. *l*. 21) The MS अथ वा (retained in both eds.) is better read as अथ चा°. The expression अथ च indicates a new point (replied in द्रव्यवच्चोपदेशे etc.). — (3) (*p*. 4, *l*. 24) The MS असत्यरत्वे is read as असति विवृतत्वे in both the eds. I read it as असत्यचत्वे which is strongly supported by both orthography and the meaning. — (4) I have retained the irregular अन्तोदात्तो of the MS (retained in Sw also); AL correct it into अन्त उदात्तो. — (5) (*p*. 4, *l*. 25) Like the previous eds., I take प्रत्ययवाचक of the MS as really standing for प्रत्यये चायक. — (6) Sw retains स्वरेण of the MS with a querry after the sentence. I follow the obvious emendation (into स्वरो न) of AL. — (7) (*p*, 5, *l*. 1) I add ऽपि after यद्यपि एको as required by meaning and as supported by Kaiy. — (8) (*p*. 5. *l*. 2) Sw very happily supplies a *Mbh. pratīka* तदर्थम् which is to be taken as paraphrased by आकारार्थम् in the *Dīp*. — (9) (*p*. 5, *l*. 7) The *Mbh*. reads as : तद् गुरु भवति । तस्माद् वक्तव्यं धात्वा° etc. — (10) (*p*. 5, *l*. 9) चिदिदम् of the MS is read as त्विदिदम् by AL, (better) as चेदिदम् by Sw.

[1. 11]

दीर्घप्लुतवचने च संवृतनिवृत्त्यर्थः (वा. ३) gives another reason why *a* has to be declared as *vivṛta*. In grammar often a long substitute of *a* is taught (e. g. P. 7. 3. 101 : अतो दीर्घो यञि ।). The long (or prolated) substitute of *a* (which is

naturally *saṁvṛta*) will have to be *saṁvṛta* as required by the principle of *āntaratamya* (P. 1. 1. 50 : स्थानेऽन्तरतमः ।). The *Vār*. points out that to prevent this undesired possibility also, अकारस्य विवृतोपदेश is necessary.

We learn from Bhar. that there were two views as to which particular *a* is meant by Kāt. when he frames this *Vār*. According to some, says Bhar., this *Vār*. adduces an additional reason for declaring *a* in the Akṣaras° to be *vivṛta* (केचिद् वर्णयन्ति ... ख्यायते). According to others, *a* in verbal roots etc. is meant (केचिद्धात्वा ... चक्षते). Bhar. has an additional point to make (अत्र चेदं चोद्यते ।) : There is another difficulty also (and, indeed, a difficulty of the मूले कुठारः type). If *a* is allowed to remain *samvṛta*, there cannot be any lengthening at all (whether *vivṛta ā* or *saṁvṛta ā*) for the simple reason that the lengthening requires an *ac* (see above *pp*. 113–114), while the *saṁvṛta a* cannot be looked upon as *ac* (since the *pratyāhāra ac* presupposes a *vivṛta a*).

Observations : (1) The MS reads त्विदं (*l*. 15). It is possible that चेदं was the original reading. The above interpretation is based upon this conjectural text. (2) The MS, and also the two older editions, read अनण्त्वात्. The context of the argument requires अनच्त्वात्, which I have restored. (3) A word अकारस्य is missing in the text. That creates an impression that संवृतत्वात् and दीर्घप्लुतस्य are syntactically connected. But that is not so. अकारस्य संवृतत्वात् is the intended construction. Again, it is अकारस्य (and not दीर्घप्लुतस्य) which is connected with स्थानित्वा°. The Genitive in दीर्घप्लुतस्य is also confusing. What is meant is : the status of an original in *a* with reference to the substitutes viz. *ā* and the prolated *ā*, cannot be reasonably explained because of the *saṁvṛta* nature of *a*. To put this in Sanskrit : दीर्घप्लुतादेशनिरूपितस्य अकारनिष्ठस्य स्थानित्वस्यानुपपत्तिः, तस्य (अकारस्य) संवृतत्वेन अनच्त्वात् । Lastly (4) Kaiy. and Nāg. do not make any mention of this difference of view referred to by Bhar. They probably took the *Vār*. as referring to the *a* in *dhātvādi*. Only the *Chāyā* says so expressly. On Kaiy.'s विवृतत्वप्रतिज्ञाने प्रयोजनान्तरमाह, it remarks : धात्वादाविति भावः ।

(*p*. 5, *l*. 15) नैव लोके न च वेदे. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh*. : नैव लोके न च वेदे दीर्घप्लुतौ संवृतौ स्तः । कौ तर्हि ? विवृतौ । यौ स्तस्तौ भविष्यतः । The suggestion made in the *Vār*. is refuted in the *Mbh*. on the ground of sheer absence of a *saṁvṛta* long and pluta vowel in usage (शिष्ट[? °ष्टा]प्रयोगं हेतुमाह as the *Dīp*. says). — Here Kaiy. and Nāg. anticipate an objection against this statement of the *Mbh*. (not anticipated by Bhar.) and also give a reply to it. The objection is : Alright. Accepted that the long substitutes will not be *saṁvṛta*. But how does it mean that the substitutes will automatically be *vivṛta* ? The *vivṛta* substitutes cannot come in because of the absence of closest affinity (ननु संवृतयोस्तयोरभावेऽपि संवृतस्य विवृतौ न स्यातामेव, आन्तरतम्याभावात् as Nāg. puts it). Kaiy., anticipating such as objection, replies that on the strength of such rules as

P. 7. 3. 101 and 6. 1. 113 the long *vivṛta* substitutes will take place even in the absence of *āntaratamya*, for otherwise the rules will become meaningless : असत्यपि सावर्ण्ये (= आन्तरतम्ये) लिङ्गादकारस्य संवृतस्य विवृतौ दीर्घप्लुतौ भविष्यतः, यदयम् 'अतो दीर्घो यञि' 'अतो रोरप्लुतादप्लुते' इत्याहेति भावः।

(*p*. 5, *l*. 17) स्थानी प्रकल्पयेदेतौ (cited to support the *Vār*.) is a part of an anuṣṭubh line स्थानी प्रकल्पयेदेतावनुस्वारो यथा यणौ which is explained by the *Mbh*. thus : संवृतः स्थानी संवृतौ दीर्घप्लुतौ प्रकल्पयेद् अनुस्वारो यथा यणम्। तद्यथा। सय्ँयन्ता सव्ँवत्सरः यल्ँलोकं तल्ँलोकमिति। अनुस्वारः स्थानी यणमनुनासिकं प्रकल्पयति। when *y v l* follow, a preceding final Anusvāra is optionally replaced by *y v l*. If the replacement takes place, the resulting substitutes in practice are not pure semi-vowels, but their nasal varieties, *ỹ ṽ l̃*. Evidently the original Anusvāra exercises its nasalic influence on the substitute. A similar phenomenon may take place here, and, under the influence of the *saṁvṛta* original a *saṁvṛta* long vowel will come in. That is the argument.

Bhar. gives two views of looking at the above argument in the *Mbh*. According to some, the rule is powerful enough to bring about (निर्वर्तकं लक्षणम्) a substitute which has closest affinity with the original. According to others like the *ihabhavat* (we do not know who specifically is referred to here) such rules merely indicated that a nasal semi-vowel or *saṁvṛta* long vowel could be taken as permitted by Pāṇini by reason of their having closest affinity with the original. Anyway, the threat of a *saṁvṛta* long vowel is there. — (*p*. 5, *l*. 20) The *Mbh*. विषमः उपन्यासः etc. refutes this parallel and the argument based on it. The full text of the *Mbh*. is as follows : विषम उपन्यासः। युक्तं यत् सतस्तत्र प्रक्लृप्तिर्भवति। सन्ति हि यणः सानुनासिका निरनुनासिकाश्च। दीर्घप्लुतौ पुनर्नैव लोके न च वेदे संवृतौ स्तः। कौ तर्हि? विवृतौ। यौ स्तस्तौ भविष्यतः। The nasal semi-vowels *are* there. So when an original (like the Anusvāra) happens to be nasal, the nasal semi-vowels are preferred to the pure ones for substitution. But the *saṁvṛta* long vowels simply do not exist. How can a non-entity threaten to come in? — (*p*. 5, *l*. 21) The *Dīp*. points out that uttering a long vowel as *saṁvṛta* is simply an impossibility like walking on head. With the semi-vowels it is a different thing, though even here *r* is an exception. The *Dīp*. sums up the two reasons for rejecting the possibility of a long close vowel : (i) absence of usage (शिष्टाप्रयोगः) and (ii) impossibility of its utterance (अशक्यत्वं).

(*p*. 5, *l*. 26) एवमपि कुत एतत्। The full text of the *Mbh*. represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : एवमपि कुत एतत् — तुल्यस्थानौ प्रयत्नभिन्नौ भविष्यतः, न पुनस्तुल्यप्रयत्नौ स्थानभिन्नौ स्याताम्, ईकार ऊकारो वेति? This *Mbh*. takes objection against the above mentioned *Mbh*. statement : कौ तर्हि? विवृतौ। यौ स्तस्तौ भविष्यतः. Bhar. gives two different ways of explaining this objection : (1) The objector accepts that only those vowels which actually exist can come in as

substitutes for *a*. But even accepting this (एवमपि), he says that *ā ā*3 are not the only long vowels which exist, *ī ū* also are there, and have the same manner of articulation, viz. *saṁvṛta*. Why should they not come in as long substitutes? Perhaps it may be said that *ī ū* have a different place of articulation than that of *a*. As against this it can be pointed out that *ā* also differs from *a* in the manner of articulation. After all, there is no long vowel which would agree with *a* in both the point and also the manner of articulation. Both *ā* on the one hand and *ī ū* on the other are defective in their own way. Then why do you take it for granted that *ā* alone is likely to come in as a substitute because of the common point of articulation? *ī ū* also could equally press their claim to be the substitute, because of their common manner of articulation viz. *saṁvṛta*.

अथोच्यते ... प्रयत्नत्वं कुतः? The objector shrewdly guesses what is passing in the mind of the opponent. All the vowels (exceptor *a*) are known to be *vivṛta* (विवृतं करणं स्वरोष्मणाम्). How does the objector dare to take *ī ū* as *saṁvṛta* and thus to bolster up their claim to be substitutes? This doubt is here anticipated by the objector. — For विवृतं करणं स्वरोष्मणां, cf. विवृतं स्वरोष्मणाम् (ऋक्तन्त्र I. 3), विवृतमूष्मणां स्वराणां च (लि.कौ.) etc. — (*p*. 5, *l*. 28) तत्र वर्णयन्ति ... साम्नः इति। Bhar. says that in order to justify that *ī ū* are *saṁvṛta*, some people quote a citation from a Prātiśākhya which says that *ī ū* and *ṛ* are close except in the *ārbhavasāman* (य्वृतः संवृता अन्यत्रार्भवसाम्नः). This in their view justifies the *Mbh*. that because of their *saṁvṛta* character *ī ū* could equally claim to be the substitutes of (the *saṁvṛta*) *a*.

Note: आर्भवसामन्, otherwise called आर्भवपवमानस्तोत्र. This is the name of the first *stotra* chanted in the third pressing of the Soma in the Agniṣṭoma, (see *Śrautakośa* II, i, pp. 420–431). Although the *ṛc*-s sung are not addressed to the Ṛbhus, but to the Pavamāna Soma, the reason why the name Ārbhava is given to this Sāman is, according to the *Ait.Br.*, that Prajāpati gave them a share in the third pressing after having promoted the Ṛbhus from mortals to immortals. Read: 'यद्धार्भवीषु स्तुवतेऽथ कस्मादार्भवः पवमान इत्याचक्षत इति। प्रजापतिर्वै पित ऋभून् मर्त्यान् सतोऽमर्त्यान् कृत्वा तृतीयसवन आभजत्। तस्माद्धार्भवीषु स्तुवतेऽथार्भवः पवमान इत्याचक्षते (*Ait.Br.* VI. 12, Ānandāśrama ed. pp. 712–713).

(*p*. 6, *l*. 1) एतच्चासत्। ... विवृता एव। Bhar. now rejects the explanation of the *Mbh*. passage given so far. It is wrong (असत्) to regard *ī ū* as having a common manner of articulation on the basis of some Prātiśākhya which says that *ī ū* are close. This is only a statement of *one* Prātiśākhya (पार्षदकृतिः). It is not a universally accepted view. It is held in one branch of the Sāmaveda (which records a particular feature of chanting only), and that too in a restricted context viz. outside the Ārbhavasāmans. It is unlikely that such a great author

as Patañjali will put in such an objection based on so flimsy grounds. The *Mbh.* objection has to be explained in a different way, says Bhar.

(2) तस्मादयमर्थः...न सिध्यति। Bhar. now gives a sound interpretation which, he evidently thinks, must have been intended by Pat. Here एवमपि means even when *a* is declared to be *vivṛta* (विवृतेऽपि सत्यकारस्य). (In the previous interpretation एवमपि meant : ' यौ स्तस्तौ भविष्यत : ' इत्यङ्गीकृत्यापि ।) Even when *a* is declared *vivṛta*, still *ā* is not the only long vowel; *ī ū* also are *vivṛta* and long vowels. What will prevent them from coming in as long substitutes of *a* ? This seems to be the second interpretation of the *Mbh.* approved by Bhar. himself. To this *Mbh.*, a reply will be given in the following *Mbh.* : वक्ष्यति ' स्थानेन्तरतमः ' ... etc. (which is not noticed in the *Dīp.*) which explains why affinity by place of articulation is preferred to affinity on other grounds.

From अकारो हि विवृत: onwards (*p.* 6, *l.* 3) the *Dīp.* brings in another point, viz. the degree of openness of the vowels. It seems that there is some confusion here. The *Mbh.* एवमपि कुत एतत् means, according to the second interpretation, acceptable personally to Bhar., that *ī ū* being equally *vivṛta* as *ā*, there is nothing to prevent them from coming in as substitutes for the *a* which is sought to be declared *vivṛta*. Here, however, he brings in the question of the degree of openness of different vowels. He says that *a* is *vivṛta* while both *ā* and *ī ū* are more *vivṛta*. Since the original and substitute have to have the same mode of utterance (तुल्यप्रयत्नाभ्यामेव भवितव्यम्), *ā* cannot come in as a substitute equally as well as *ī ū*. So विवृतेऽपि सत्यकारस्य न सिध्यति. Or, another possibility (not expressly mentioned in the *Dīp.*) is that if the minor difference of the degree of openness is to be ignored in the case of *ā* (so that the desired substitution could be effected), by the same logic *ī ū* also could equally be legitimate substitutes.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 4) यद्येवं ग्रहणमपि ... भविष्यति। An objection against the above argument and a reply to it. If you are going to be that fastidious, then *a* cannot even comprehend *ā* (ग्रहणमपि न भविष्यति) with the further result that operations taught for *a* will not apply to *ā*. This is not desirable but it will threaten to follow as a result of your logic. — वचनाद् ग्रहणं भविष्यति is the reply. Since otherwise the teaching of operations for *ā* through *a* will be meaningless if they are not to take effect, so on the strength of their teaching (वचनात्) *ā* will be understood as included in *a*. — अथ वा ... पदेश इति । An alternative solution. The word विवृतोपदेश: in the *Vār.* should be understood in the sense of विवृततरोपदेशः. Then there would be complete *sāvarṇya* and the difficulty ग्रहणमपि न प्राप्नोति will be removed. — तत् कथं ... प्रतिपत्तव्यम् । An objection against विवृतोपदेश = विवृततरोपदेश interpretation. It is said further on in the *Mbh.* (under *Vār.* 10 : संध्यक्षरेषु विवृतत्वात्) that *a* which is the initial part of *ai* and *au* is more open (विवृततर) than the simple *a* (संध्यक्षरेषु ... तदन्यस्मात्). (If that *a* is विवृततर, we cannot now call

the simple *a* (intended to be declared विवृत) as विवृततर. The *Dīp.* answers by saying that this is no serious diffiiculty. There (in the *Mbh.* I. 25. 14), विवृततर should be understood in the sense of विवृततम 'most open'.

Readings and punctuation: (1) (*p.* 5, *l.* 15) For the emendation चेदं (for the MS. त्वेदं), and अनच्त्वात् (for the MS. अनण्त्वात्), see above (*p.* 117, *ll.*14–17).– (2) (*p.* 5, *l.* 17) I have emended निवर्तकम् into निर्वर्तकम् in view of the expression प्रकल्पयेत् in the *Vār.* — (3) MS. reads वक्ष्यन्ति मन्यन्ते. I have dropped, with Sw, वक्ष्यन्ति. Perhaps the two different verbs indicate the scribe's attempts to read the original, of which he was not certain. — (4) (*p.* 5, *l.* 18) The MS नान्यत्रस्था: is emended as नान्यन्तस्था: (with a question mark) by Sw and as अन्तस्था: by AL. I follow the latter. — (5) Sw retains the ungrammatical प्रयुज्यन्ते of the MS. I correct it to प्रयुज्जते with AL. — (6) (*p.* 5, *l.* 21) MS °माहाशक्य°. AL probably took the vertical stroke after ह as a daṇḍa. Ignoring it as unnecessary they read °माह शक्य°. Sw rightly reads: °माह — अशक्य°. — (7) (*p.* 5, *l.* 23) वाशक्य (= वा+अशक्य) is again wrongly split into वा शक्य by AL. — (8) (*p.* 5, *l.* 24) The apparently irregular ह्युक्ता: is emended into हि उक्तम्. उक्ता: perhaps was confused as an adjective qualifying °भावना:. — (9) (*p.* 5, *l.* 26) The MS अपदिष्टौ (which I read with Sw as व्यपदिष्टौ) is read as उपदिष्टौ by AL. — (10) The corrupt MS. शिष्टाप्रगौ शक्य° is read as शिष्टप्रयोग: शक्य° (evidently wrong) and as शिष्टा प्रयोगोऽशक्यं° by Sw. — (11) (*p.* 5, *l.* 27) MS and eds. इकारो°. — (12) (*p.* 6, *l.* 1) The sentence अस्यामेव शाखायाम् etc. is read in the MS as: अस्यामेव साघोयामार्भत् मुक्ता सामान्तरेण विवृतत्वम्. AL read: अस्यामेव साम्नामार्भत्रं मुक्त्वा सामान्तरे न वि°; Sw अस्यामेव शाखायामार्भवं मुक्त्वा सामान्तराणां संवृतत्वम्. — (13) (*p.* 6, *l.* 4) AL तुल्यप्रयत्नानामेव (for °नाभ्यामेव). — (14) (*p.* 6, *l.* 5) AL's punctuation: अथवा विवृतोपदेश एतदुक्तं भवति। विवृततरोपदेश इति तत् कथम् is not followed here as it is confusing and it misses the import.

[2]

तत्रानुवृत्तिनिर्देशे सवर्णाग्रहणमनण्त्वात् (*Vār.* 4). This *Vār.* opens up a new topic. The Vārttikakāra further shows the drawback of the व्यक्तिवाद and finally advocates the आकृतिवाद as a way out of the difficulty. The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* (not mentioned by Bhar.) reads as follows: तत्रानुवृत्तिनिर्देशे सवर्णानां ग्रहणं न प्राप्नोति — 'अस्य च्वौ', 'यस्येति च'। किं कारणम्? अनण्त्वात्। न ह्येतेऽणो येऽनुवृत्तौ। के तर्हि? येऽक्षरसमाम्नाय उपदिश्यन्ते।

The argument here as explained by Bhar., is that we can accept only that *a* as *aṇ* which we can definitely identify with the *a* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya. Such an *a* is the one in the Pratyāhāra terms like *ak*, where, on the strength of the code-letter *k* we are sure of the identity of the two (तत्रानुबन्धेन प्रतिपद्यामहे, स एवायमिति). But where Pāṇini employs a pure *a*, i. e. without any code-letter

characteristic of the Akṣaras, e. g. in P. 7. 4. 32 : अस्य च्वौ etc., there is no guarantee on the व्यक्तिपक्ष (on which the discussion is all along proceeding) that *a* in P. 7. 4. 32 is the same as *a* in the Akṣara. So, when no *aṇ*, there will be no comprehensive power in this *a* to include in it *ā* (taught by P. 1. 1. 69). Consequently, the replacement of *a* by *ī* before *cvi* taught by P. 7. 4. 32 : अस्य च्वौ will be effective only in, say, शुक्लीभवति (fr. शुक्ल + च्वि + भू); it will not be available (though desired) in forms like मालीभवति (fr. माला + च्वि + भू). Similarly in forms like चौडि, बालाकि (matronymics fr. चूडा, बलाका with इ by P. 4. 1. 96 : बाह्वादिभ्यश्च), the dropping of the stem. final *ā* (by P. 6. 4. 148 : यस्येति च) will not be available.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 8) अनुवृत्तिनिर्देशे : Though the ultimate meaning of this expression is not difficult to make out, how it is to be extracted from the expression (particularly what exactly is meant by *vṛtti*) is not quite clear. Kaiy. explains : वृत्तिः शास्त्रस्य लक्ष्ये प्रवृत्तिः, तदनुगतो निर्देशोऽनुवृत्तिनिर्देशः। This explanation of *vṛtti* is evidently based on Pat's का पुनर्वृत्तिः ? शास्त्रस्य प्रवृत्तिः on the *Vār.* : वृत्तिसमवायार्थ उपदेशः (*Paspaśā Vār.* 15). But this explanation evidently does not help in our present context. Nāg. does not offer any explanation here[1] but under P. 1. 1. 69 where our present *Vār.* is repeated he explains : ... वृत्तिं वर्णसमाम्नायमनुगतस्तत्सदृशोऽनुवृत्तिरकारादिस्तस्य निर्देशः स्वरूपेणोच्चारणम्। I have followed this in the translation, though the difficulty of explaing how वृत्ति means अक्षरसमाम्नाय still remains.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 11) यथैवाकारः (= °व आकारः) प्रत्याख्य एव : Since *ā* is not directly read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya, it is not reckoned as *aṇ*. So if some operation is taught for *ā*, it applies to *ā* only, not to *a*. The same will be the fate of *a* in P. 7. 4. 32 etc. It will convey only itself, but, because of absence of *aṇ* character, not *ā* also.

Kaiy. puts the objection succinctly thus : 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' इत्यादावयमेवाकारोऽनुकृत इति ककारादिना चिह्नेन ज्ञायते। ततश्चाणत्वात् तस्य ग्राहकत्वमस्तु। 'अस्य च्वौ' इत्यादौ त्वकारस्यानणत्वाद् ग्राहकत्वं न प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः। On चिह्नेन Nāg. observes : प्रत्युच्चारणं वर्णभेदेऽपि 'अकः ...' इत्यादौ ककारेण चिह्नेनैतदनुकरणत्वानुमानमिति भावः।

[2. 1]

एकत्वादकारस्य सिद्धम् (5) is a *Vār.* which refutes the objection taken in [2]. It is, however, not the final view, but merely एकदेशिसमाधानवार्त्तिक. The *Mbh.* on it runs as : एकोऽयमकारो यश्चाक्षरसमाम्नाये, यश्चानुवृत्तौ, यश्च धात्वादिस्थः। The reply is based on the identity, and the consequent *aṇ* character, of all *a* sounds, no matter where they occur. All *a*'s are one. So they all have सवर्णग्राहकत्व. — The predicate सिद्धम् always implies the subject इष्टम् ('the goal is achieved'),

1. He simply says : साक्षाल्लक्ष्यसंस्कारकबोधजनकः [Scil : न तु प्रत्याहारद्वारा] इत्यर्थः।

which, in the present case, is the सवर्णग्राहकत्व of *a* in P. 7. 4. 32 (अस्य च्वौ) etc. and consequently the establishment of forms like मालीभवति, चौडि: etc.

Bhar. is here unusually laconic : Just two words (अनुवृत्तादत्वात्) which say that *a*-ness is common to all the instances of the utterance of the *a* sound. He does not say what exactly is the nature of this oneness. His use of the word *atva* creates the impression that he means oneness of the *jāti*. But he certainly did not mean it that way. Firstly, Kāt. himself will introduce this *jāti* (or *ākṛti*) view later on. Secondly, Kaiy. definitely says that the एकव्यक्ति view is introduced here. As a *varṇa* (phoneme) *a* is one, it is a single entity, whatever its pitch, or other properties. These latter are not distinctive, in that they are rather extraneous, belonging as they do to the physical sounds (*a* etc.) which (*dhvani*-s) are manifestors only. This is like the variety of reflections of one and the same object owing to the variety of reflections. Read : एकैवाकारव्यक्तिः उदात्तादि-भेदप्रतिभासस्तु व्यञ्जकध्वनिकृतः, खड्गतैलादर्शादिभेदे प्रतिबिम्ब[i. e. भिन्नभिन्नाकारप्रतिबिम्ब]-प्रतिभासवत् । Read also the *chāyā* : एतेन 'जातिस्फोटमाश्रित्य परिहरति – एकत्वादिति' इति कृष्णोक्तमपास्तम्, व्यक्तिपक्षस्यैव प्रक्रान्तत्वात् ।

This एकव्यक्ति view of *varṇa*-s is the one which is held by the Mīmāṁsakas.

The mention of अकारस्य alone in the *Vār*. is only by way of illustration. What applies to *a*, also applies to other phonemes like *i* (अकारस्य निदर्शनार्थत्वाद् [1]इकारादीनामप्यैक्यं बोध्यम् — कै.).

[2. 2]

अनुबन्धसंकरस्तु (6) is a *Vār*. which takes objection to the अकारस्य एकत्वम् view on the ground that in that case a confusion of operations indicated by the different code-letters will take place. अनुबन्धसंकरः = अनुबन्धकार्यसंकरः. The *Mbh*. explains the *Vār*. thus . अनुबन्धसंकरस्तु प्राप्नोति । 'कर्मण्यण्', 'आतोनुपसर्गे कः' इति । केऽपि णितकृतं प्राप्नोति ।

Mbh. : केऽपि णित्कृतं प्राप्नोति : When, for example, a suffix *ka* follows गो + दा (by P. 3. 2. 3), normally the final *ā* is elided by P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोप इटि च, and we get गोदः. But if अकारस्य एकत्वम् is admitted, then, *a* being the same in both अण् (P. 3. 2. 1) and क (3), the code-letter *ṇ* (in *aṇ* taught in P. 3. 2. 1) will present itself here (in P. 3. 2. 3) also. This, in its turn, will entail union-semivowel *y* (*yuk*, by P. 7. 3. 33 : आतो युक् चिण्कृतोः) resulting in an undesired form (say *गोदायः). Or, another possibility is, that to avoid the uselessness of reading P. 3. 2. 3, both *aṇ* and *ka* will be applied alternately. —

1. But when Nāg. remarks : इकारादीनामपीति । सर्वध्वनिभिरेकस्य स्फोटस्यैव तत्तद्रूपेणाभिव्यञ्जनात्, he is going too far, which was not meant by Kaiy.

Two possibilities are mentioned : either there will be a wrong form *गोदाय: alone, or, it will appear optionally, along with the correct गोद:.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 18) तत्र गोदः इति परत्वात् कः स्यात् । This is a reply to an anticipated objection against केऽपि in the *Mbh.* केऽपि णित्कृतं प्राप्नोति. How do you say केऽपि 'when *ka* (i. e. the suffix *a* with the code-letter *k*) is there?' Since, on your own view, *a* is the same, the suffix *aṇ* and *ka* will come in simultaneously. There is no question of *ka* being there first, and then *aṇ* (i. e. the operation due to the code-letter *ṇ*) coming in. The *Dīp.* परत्वात् कः स्यात् answers this objection. — But then a question arises. If केऽपि णित्कृतं प्राप्नोति were true, why did Pāṇini furnish the code-letter *k* at all to *a* in P. 3. 2. 3? Where will it have an exclusive scope? उत्तरार्थं कित्करणम् is the reply. P. 2. 3. 4 reads as सुपि स्थ:. Here कर्मण्यण् (P. 3. 2. 1) does not come down, since *sthā* being an intransitive verb, कर्मन् is not possible there. So कः which is continued from P. 3. 2. 3 alone applies there.

[2. 3]

किरिणा गिरिणेति — This is a part of the *Mbh.* on the next *Vār.* which reads as एकाजनेकाज्ग्रहणेषु चानुपपत्तिः and points out another difficulty (द्वितीयाक्षेपवार्त्तिकम्) if अकारस्यैकत्वम् were accepted. Certain rules of grammar, like those on accent, are conditioned by the number of vowels in a word. The अकारस्यैकत्वम् view would disturb this arrangement. To illustrate : P. 6. 1. 168 : सावेकाचस्तृतीयादिविभक्तिः says that case endings from Instrumental onwards are accented if they follow a stem which is monosyllabic before the Locative pl. ending *-su.* (For example *vācā́*). Now in words like *kiri*, *giri* etc. there are two vowels. Since these nominal stems are not *ekāc* (monosyllabic), forms like *kiriṇā giriṇā* are not accented on the case ending. If, however, अकारस्यैकत्वम् is accepted, these words will have to be deemed as *ekāc*, and consequently they will be accented on the case ending (**kiriṇā́ giriṇā́*), which are wrong forms (किरिणा गिरिणेत्येकाज्लक्षणमन्तोदात्तत्वं प्राप्नोति *Mbh.*).

(*p.* 6, *l.* 20) अकारो नोदा ... प्रतिषिद्धत्वात् — Although it is the vowel *a* which is under discussion, the *Mbh.* gives examples of words ending in *i* (*kiri* etc.). Bhar. points out that this was necessary for the *Mbh.* because the acute accent on the case ending taught by P. 6. 1. 168 is prohibited, among others, in the case of stems ending in *a* by P. 6. 1. 182 : न गोश्वन्-साववर्ण-राडङ्क्रुङ्क्रुद्भ्यः.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 21) घटेन तरति इति — This *pratīka* stands for the *Mbh.* : इह च घटेन तरति घटिक इति द्व्यज्लक्षणष्ठन् न प्राप्नोति. Another difficulty. Words which are dissyllabic will have to be treated as monosyllabic if there the same vowel occurs twice. Thus words like घट will be deprived of their द्व्यच् (dissyllabic) character

and will not have the suffix *ṭhan* in the sense of *tena tarati* ' swimms with it ' taught by P. 4. 4. 7 : नौद्व्यचष्ठन्. — (*p*. 6, *l*. 22) वस्तु, i. e. the phoneme *a*. In *ghaṭa*, there are not two (*a*)vowels, but just two utterances, i, e. occurrences, of a single entity *a*. — ठंस्तु बाहुकादिषु कृतार्थः — This replies a possible question. If words like *ghaṭa* are not to have *ṭhan*, where will the sū. find scope ? In the dissyllabic stems with dissimilar vowels like *bāhu*, is the reply. Thus we have the word *bāhuka* in the sense of बाहुभ्यां तरति (' ठंस्तु बाहुकादिषु कृतार्थः । '). In this example, *ṭha* is replaced by *ka* (and not by *ika*) by P. 7. 3. 51 : इसुसुक्ता-न्तात् कः.

[2. 4]

द्रव्यवच्चोपचाराः — A third objection against the अकारस्यैकत्वम् view. The *Mbh.* on this *Vār*. explains it thus : द्रव्यवच्चोपचाराः प्राप्नुवन्ति । तद्यथा द्रव्येषु नैकेन घटेनानेको युगपत् कार्यं करोति । एवमिममकारं नानेको युगपदुच्चारयेत्. Just as a jar can be used only by one person at a time, similarly the sound *a* could be uttered by only one person at a time. The other part of this argument is : but many people do utter *a* simultaneously. And so the view अकारस्यैकत्वम् is invalid. Bhar. merely explains कार्यं of the *Mbh*. by घृताद्याहरणादि which was the least necessary.

(*p*. 6. *l*. 24) अकारं अश्वात्कारवर्तिनमुच्चारयति । This brings out the contrast between the *a*-sound (alleged to be a single entity by the opponent) and an object like a jar. A jar can be used by one person only at a time. But *a* can be uttered simultaneously by many people, say when they utter words like *aśva*, *atka* and *ara*. This shows that *a* is not the same everywhere. अकारस्य एकत्वम् cannot be accepted. (Here before अश्वा° a तु was expected so as to bring out the contrast between the two situations.) For a discussion of the actual reading of the MS here and my emendation of it, see below under Readings.

Readings : (1) (*p*. 6, *l*. 11) The MS प्रतिपद्यासमायमिति is read as °पद्यते सोऽयमिति by AL and as °द्यते स एवाय° by Sw. — (2) The MS नास्यवत्यं (or नास्यच्यं), retained by Sw, is rightly read as नास्त्यणत्वं by AL. (3) (*p*. 6, *l*. 16) Sw drops इत्यस्य, which does not make any sense. Alternatively, another way is to read one more इत्यस्य after °सर्गे कः. (4) (*p*. 6, *l*. 17) Neither the MS nor the eds. read a न between न च and गृह्यते, but it is required by the context — unless of course one understands चोर as ऽचोर and takes गृह्यते in the sense of ' is looked upon as '. (5) (*p*. 6, *l*. 18) The MS कक्र is read as ठक् by Sw, but ठक् is clearly irrelevant here. I follow AL. (6) (*p*. 6, *l*. 20) the ओकारो of the MS is evidently अकारो as emended by Sw. AL's सावेकाच्त्वे (not supported by the MS) merely describes the context, but it deprives the verb उदाह्रियते of its object. — (7) (*p*. 6, *l*. 23) The *Dīp*. has एककालं for युगपद् of the *Mbh*. (8) (*p*. 6, *l*. 24) The MS here actually reads : अकारं अश्वात्कारवर्जितमुच्चारयति which is a classic example of

how a text can get corrupted in the MS transmission and also of how it can be retrieved if the problem is attacked in the proper manner. The text as it is in the MS is quite clear and so it is retained by Sw but with a question mark since it makes no meaning. AL emend अश्वात्कारवर्जितं to अश्व एकार° but what purpose it serves I fail to understand.

The reconstructed reading has to fit in the context. Here the author is evidently contrasting the *a*-sound with a jar. In the previous sentence it is said that many people cannot use a jar simultaneously for fetching water. In contrast, this sentence must be saying that many people can utter simultaneously the *a*-sound. But what must be the correct text which would give this meaning ?

Concentrating on the MS, I find that what is taken as र्जि could equally be र्ति. Combining this with the usual observation that in this MS (as also elsewhere) त and न are often confused, I am inclined to take the last part of this expression as °वर्तिनम् which means 'being or found in'. Since this must qualify अकारं, the remaining text, viz. अश्वात्कार apparently contains words, each containing an *a*-sound, preferably at the beginning. A circumstance responsible for this idea is the commentary *Vṛtti* on the *Vāk*. I. 71. As it happens, this stanza speaks of the same view as is discussed in the *Mbh*. here, viz the एकव्यक्तिवाद, illustrated by अकारस्य एकत्वम्. The relevant line (ab) of the *Vāk*. stanza reads thus : पदभेदेऽपि वर्णानामेकत्वं न निवर्तते. The *Vṛtti* on it runs thus : अर्कः अश्वः अर्थः इति भिन्नेष्वप्येतेषु पदेषु ··· एक एवायमकारः ... लोके प्रयुज्यते. The source of these three examples, further, is the *Mbh*. itself under the *Vār*. युगपच्च देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनात् which is to follow later. The *Mbh*. passage reads the three words as अश्वः अर्कः अर्थः (order slightly changed in the *Vṛtti* on the *Vāk*.). This passage seems to clinch the issue. I only emend अश्वात्कार° to अश्वात्कार (cf. AL reading) and take the expression as a Dvandva of अश्व + अत्क + अर. Three different speakers uttering these three words simultaneously can be said to utter the *a*-sound simultaneously.

I would have liked to read अश्वार्कार्थ° or अश्वार्थार्क° for अश्वात्कार° of the MS, so as to bring the *Dīp*. in line with the *Mbh*. and the *Vṛtti* on the *Vāk*. But I wanted to be faithful to the MS as much as possible. And, besides, the MS text as it is equally furnishes 3 cases of words beginning with *a*. So I have retained it. —

[2. 5]

The *Vār*. (9) विषयेण तु नानालिङ्गकरणात् सिद्धम् and the following one, viz. एकाजनेकाज्ग्रहणेषु etc. refute the objection raised against the अकारस्य एकत्वम् view. The *Mbh*. on the first *Vār*. (which refutes the अनुबन्धसंकर argument) runs as follows : यदयं विषये विषये नानालिङ्गमकारं करोति 'कर्मण्यण्' (P. 3. 2. 1), 'आतोऽनुपसर्गे

कः ' (2) इति, तेन ज्ञायते, नानुबन्धसंकरोऽस्तीति । यदि हि स्यात्, नानालिङ्गकरणमनर्थकं स्यात् । एकमेवायं सर्वगुणमुच्चारयेत् । If there was to be confusion of the effects of code letters, Pāṇini would not have taken the trouble of reading the primary suffix *a* along with different code-letters in different rules. He would have read, in the very first rule in P. 3. 2. 1 for instance, the suffix as *kaṇṭ* (कर्मण्युपपदे ... कण्ट् भवति इति ब्रूयात् — *Dīp.*). Similarly Kaiy. : तत्र कर्मणि कण्ट् इति ब्रूयादित्यर्थः. सर्वगुणम् =सर्वानुबन्धकम् ·

Pat. paraphrases विषयेण by विषये विषये, hence Bhar.'s comment : वाक्यकारः सामान्यं ... °सप्तमीभ्यां कथयति । Here भेद means व्यक्तिभेद. Kaiy's remark is almost a copy of Bhar. : विषयेणेति वार्त्तिककारेण करणत्वेन, सामान्यरूपतया चाभेदेन विषयो निर्दिष्टः। भाष्यकारस्त्वधिकरणत्वं व्यक्तिभेदाद् वीप्सां च प्रतिपादयति । — (*p.* 7, *l.* 1) लुप्तनिर्दिष्टान् प्रतिजानीत इति — In those cases where all the code-letters going with a suffix etc. cannot be uttered together (cf. the *Mbh.*: न ह्ययमनुबन्धैः शल्यकवच्छक्य उपचेतुम्), he would have declared the others to be taken as read. The technical explanation for their not being heard is that they are dropped as soon as read (लुप्तनिर्दिष्टान्. The elision is apparently to be attributed to P. 8. 2. 23 : संयोगान्तस्य लोपः). For an objection against the technique of लुप्तनिर्दिष्ट often resorted to by Pat. and Bhar.'s reply to it, see the *Dīp.* Āhn. III, p. 14, lines 11–15.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 2) आयम्य हि द्वयोरेवेत्संज्ञा स्यात् is a part of the *Mbh.* which refutes the *Vār.* विषयेण तु ... etc. If Pāṇini did not read all the code-letters in a bunch, that is because at the most (*āyamya*) only two code-letters could be had that way, the first (by P. 1. 3. 5 etc.) and the last(by P. 1. 3. 3). The intervening letters will be unable to get the designation *it*. So the circumstance that Pāṇini does not read the code-letters in one bunch is due to necessity; it is no clue to नानुबन्धसंकरोऽस्ति. Similarly Kaiy. : नैवं (i. e. न शल्यकवत्) सर्वानुबन्धयुक्तोऽकारः शक्यो निर्देष्टुम् । आद्यन्तयोरेवेत्संज्ञाविधानान् मध्यपातिनां श्रवणप्रसङ्गात् ।

इत्संज्ञैव ... सिद्धत्वात् is an explanation which aims at justifying the gerund आयम्य (आ-यम् + ल्यप्) occurring in the *Mbh.* Such a gerund requires that its agent should be the same as that of the other action (usually of the main verb), cf. P. 3. 4. 21 : समानकर्तृकयोः पूर्वकाले. Now the agent of स्यात् is इत्संज्ञा ; but how can it be also the agent of the आयमनक्रिया 'the activity of stretching, of being active, exerting' ? For this is an activity of an animate being (like the grammarian). Bhar. seems to say that the activity is to be figuratively attributed to the इत्संज्ञा which exerts itself, as it were, to fulfil the need of grammar. Kaiy. follows suit : इत्संज्ञैवायच्छते = व्याप्रियते इत्येककर्तृकत्वादायम्येत्युक्तम् । — द्वयोः, i. e. for the initial and the final sounds. Cf. *Mbh.* : कयोः ? आद्यन्तयोः । The sūtras P. 1. 3. 5–8 provide for the name *it* to initial sounds and P. 1. 3. 3 to final sounds.

(*p. 7, l.* 4) विषयेण तु[1] पुनर्लिङ्गकरणात् सिद्धम्. The *Vār.* विषयेण तु नानालिङ्ग° is rephrased thus, नानालिङ्ग° being replaced by पुनर्लिङ्ग°, to obviate the objection in the *Mbh.* इत्संज्ञाप्रक्लृप्त्यर्थमेतत् स्यात्. Pāṇini is seen to repeat a grammatical element (like an affix) with the same code-letter. Thus he reads *aṇ* in प्राग्दीव्यतोऽण् (P. 4. 1. 83). Subsequently he again reads the same affix in शिवादिभ्योऽण् (P. 4. 1. 112). If there had been confusion of the effects of code-letters, there was no need for Pāṇini to need *aṇ* again in P. 4. 1. 112. He would simply have read the rule as *śivādibhyo aḥ*. The very fact that Pāṇini still reads *aṇ* there shows that there is no अनुबन्धसंकर. How else would Pāṇini lose the opportunity of saving one letter ? Read the *Mbh.* : एवं तर्हि 'विषयेण तु पुनर्लिङ्गकरणात् सिद्धम्'। यदयं त्रिषये विषये पुनर्लिङ्गमकारं करोति, 'प्राग्दीव्यतोऽण्' 'शिवादिभ्योऽण्' इति, तेन ज्ञायते, नानुबन्धसंकरोऽस्तीति। यदि हि स्यात्, पुनर्लिङ्गकरणमनर्थकं स्यात्। On this Kaiy. 'विषयेण' इत्येतद् अन्यथा व्याचष्टे, नानाशब्दमपनीय पुनःशब्दं पठित्वा। यद्यनुबन्धसंकरः स्यात्, अकारमेव शिवादिभ्यो विदध्यात्।

ननु च नियमार्थम् ... The objector refutes even the reworded *Vār.* Even this, according to him, is not conclusive, for the पुनर्लिङ्ग can be shown to be useful for some other purpose, it is not necessarily a pointer to the absence of अनुबन्धसंकर. In fact, the objector argues, the अनुबन्धसंकर *is* there. Pāṇini wants to avoid it. For instance, he wants to avoid the effects of the code-letters *ñ* and *n* in the case of the affix *a* which is to come after the *śivādi* words. The purpose of repeating *ṇ* is this restriction : the effect of *ṇ* alone takes place, not those of *ñ* or *n* etc. The पुनर्लिङ्गकरण, thus far from hinting at the absence of अनुबन्धसंकर, actually confirms it. — तत्कृतम् = तस्य पुनर्लिङ्गस्य (पुनरुक्तस्य अनुबन्धस्य) कार्यम् स्वरगुणवृद्ध्यादि. Since in the present case the पुनर्लिङ्ग is *ṇ*, so Bhar. mentions *ñ* and *n* whose effect is undesirable. — आद्युदात्तादि : A nominal form with a *ñit* or a *nit* affix has Udātta on the first syllable according to P. 6. 1. 197 : ञ्नित्यादिर्नित्यम्. A noun with a *ṇit* affix (like *aṇ*) would be *antodātta*, since an affix is *ādyudātta* as a rule (P. 3. 1. 3). For the MS reading अन्तोदात्तादीति (emended to आद्युदात्ता° in our text), see below under *Readings*.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 5) विधेयेऽसति ... 'शिवादिभ्य अ' इति। Here the *Dīp.* refutes the *niyama* argument of the opponent and reiterates the absence of *saṁkara*. This is the point involved : The पुनर्लिङ्ग *ṇ* in *śivādibhyo 'ṇ* can be interpreted in two ways. (1) There is अनुबन्धसंकर. So the status of *ṇit* is already available for *a* (after *śivādi* words). Still Pāṇini makes it *ṇit* (i. e. *aṇ*). On the maxim सिद्धे सति पुनर्ग्रहणं नियमार्थम्, this repeated teaching results in restriction (only णित्कृतम्, no ञित्कृतम्). This is the interpretation of the opponent who infers अनुबन्धसंकर from the पुनर्लिङ्गकरण. (2) There is no अनुबन्धसंकर. So the status of *ṇit* is

1. The *Dīp.* drops तु.

not otherwise available for the *śivādi a*. It is desired. So Pāṇini enjoins it, which would not be available otherwise. So there is *vidhi* 'injunction', not *niyama* 'restriction'. And it is well known that when a rule can be interpreted both as a *vidhi* and as a *niyama*, preference is always given to the *vidhi* interpretation (विधिनियमसंभवे विधिरेव ज्यायान् Pari. 100). Restriction is accepted only when injunction is not possible (विधेयेऽसति नियमो विज्ञायते, as Bhar. says). — It is to be noted that this point does not appear in the *Mbh.* Bhar. is the first to mention it. Later Kaiy. also takes it up. Read : अथोच्येत, णित्कृतमेव यथा स्यात्, ञित्कृतं मा भूदिति नियमार्थमेतत् स्यात्। तन्न, नियमाद् विधेर्बलीयस्त्वात्।

(*p.* 7, *l.* 7) लोकत एतत् सिद्धम् ... तत्तत् कार्यं लप्स्यन्ते इति। After showing that the wording पुनर्लिङ्गकरणात् conclusively proves that there is no अनुबन्धसंकर, Pat. reverts to the older wording नानालिङ्गकरणात्, with a view to showing that that reading also is capable of justifying the absence of अनुबन्धसंकर. Read : अथ वा पुनरस्तु — 'विषयेण तु नानालिङ्गकरणात् सिद्धम्' इत्येव। ननु चोक्तम् 'इत्संज्ञाप्रक्लृप्त्यर्थमेतत् स्यात्' इति। नैष दोषः। लोकत एतत् सिद्धम्। तद् यथा—लोके कश्चिदेवं देवदत्तमाह 'इह मुण्डो भव', 'इह जटिलो भव' इति; यल्लिङ्गो यत्रोच्यते तल्लिङ्गस्तत्रोपतिष्ठते। एवमयमकारो यल्लिङ्गो यत्रोच्यते तल्लिङ्गस्तत्रोपस्थास्यते'। From this *Mbh.* the *Dīp.* quotes only लोकत एतत् सिद्धम्, although the comm. pertains to the whole of the passage.

Pat. now gives a different interpretation of the *Vār.* विषयेण तु नानालिङ्ग°. The argument put forward previously viz. नानालिङ्गकरणमनर्थकं स्यात्, एकमेवायं सर्वगुणमुच्चारयेत् is withdrawn. (Cf. the *Dīp.* : नैवमुच्यते, एकमेवायं सर्वगुणमुच्चारयेदिति.) Now the emphasis is on विषये. Pat. says that in spite of oneness of *a*, the effect of a particular code-letter will not spread to other rules where the same affix (*a*) is taught with some other code-letter. It will be restricted to the context where it is taught. To give a parallel from life : a spy[1] who is ordered to be present at a particular spot in the guise of a Saṁnyāsin with a cleanly shaven head, will appear there so (*muṇḍa*); where he is ordered to appear as an ascetic with matter hair, will appear so (*jaṭila*). He will not confuse the place and the guise and will always appear at the particular place with the correct guise. So also in grammar. — The *Dīp.* शब्दवत् यत्र etc. is a paraphrase of the *Mbh.* यल्लिङ्गो यत्रोच्यते ... पतिष्ठते. — यत्र कार्ये = गूढचरत्वेन उपस्थानादौ। शब्दवत् लिङ्गम् viz. मुण्डः or जटिलः.

कार्यं = कार्ये. मुण्डादयो न कर्तव्यम् is corrupt. मुण्डादिना or some such thing was expected.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 9) चौर्ये तु ... कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते is a reply to a possible objection. It was said above in the *Dīp.* by the opponent while pleading for the अनुबन्धसंकर

1. This is Nāg.'s suggestion. Read : यथा लोके इति। प्रभ्वाज्ञया गूढचारादिरिति शेषः।

that a thief is not immune to arrest simply because he has grown long hair whereas at the time of the theft he had a clean shaved head (यथैव च मुण्डेन कृते चौर्ये कुन्तली संपन्न इति न च न गृह्यते चोर इति, *p*. 6, *l*. 17). Bhar. says that the two cases are quite different. The law does not specifically say (*śabdavat*) that the clean shaven or a hairy head is a relevant property in establishing the guilt. That is an accidental property which has no legal significance. But in the case of the code-letters it is a different thing. They are specifically laid down in specific contexts and so they are not applicable elsewhere.

(*p*. 7, *l*. 11) 'अ सांप्रतिके' (पा. ४. ३. ९) इत्यत्र ... इति नियुज्यते : This *Dīp.* discusses an objection against the absence of अनुबन्धसंकर in cases like P. 4. 3. 9. In this rule the affix is laid down in its pure form, i. e. unaccompanied by any code-letter. Since no specific code-letter is mentioned which would have blocked the effect of *ṇ* (of the general *aṇ*), what prevents the latter from penetrating here ? The reply (उच्यते । ... इति नियुज्यते) is given on the basis of a technical point. *If* Pāṇini had desired that this suffix *a* should behave as if it were *ṇit* (i. e. *aṇ*) he would not have read *a sāmpratike* (P. 4. 3. 9) as a separate rule. He would have combined P. 4. 3. 8 : मध्यान्मः with this rule and read the two as one rule : मध्यान्मोऽसांप्रतिके. (Here *a* [deleted] before सांप्रतिके is not an affix to be taught, but the negative particle *a*). The two rules as they stand separately mean : '(In the *śeṣa* senses) the affix *ma* (comes) after *madhya-*' (P. 4. 3. 8). So we have *madhyamaḥ* 'the middle one'. P. 4. 3. 9 means : '(after *madhya*) the affix *a* (comes) to denote the sense of 'mediocre' '. Now the combined single rule would also give practically the same meaning : '(In the *śeṣa* senses) the affix *ma* (comes) after *madhya*, but not when mediocrity (of the object denoted) is to be conveyed '. The implication is that in the latter case, the affix *ma* being prohibited, the general affix *aṇ* would automatically have come in. And this simple use of *a* in the *paryudāsa* sense would have served Pāṇini's purpose (पर्युदासेन सिद्धे) *if he had desired* an effect of the code-letter *ṇ* here. The very fact that he does not do so shows that अनुबन्धसंकर does not take place here. In other words, the absence of a code-letter itself is as good as a positive code-letter, in that it distinguishes that linguistic element from others having some positive code-letters. Continuing the parallel of the spy in different guises, Bhar. observes that employing a grammatical element bereft of code-letters is like employing a spy in the guise of a naked ascetic. Superficially 'naked' means without any clothes, not having any distinguishing mark. But this very fact distinguishes such an ascetic (spy) from a *śikhin*, a *jaṭila* etc. Similarly in grammar also.

It may be noted that this objection in the case of the pure affix *a* and reply to it neither find a place in the *Mbh.* nor are they later mentioned by Kaiy.

Readings : (1) (*p*. 7, *l*. 1) Sw's यावन्तो (for यावतो of MS and AL) is an unnecessary and ungrammatical emendation. — (2) AL unnecessarily change प्रतिजानीत of the MS into प्रतिजानीते. The context clearly requires optative (cf. the corresponding उच्चारयेत् in the previous sentence). — (3) (*p*. 7, *l*. 2) The *Mbh*. simply reads द्वयोर् (without एव seen in the *Dīp*.). — (4) Sw reproduces the corrupt MS इत्संज्ञै चैव. आयतीत्येक of the MS is read as आयम्येत्येक° by Sw. AL properly supply a च्छ between य and ती, but they change ती into ते to make the reading grammatically correct (cf. P. 1. 3. 28 : आङो यमहनः ।). Kaiy. also has here आयच्छते. — (5) (P. 7, *l*. 3) Sw retains (doubtfully) the corrupt MS कर्तृकसिद्ध्यत्वा. — (6) Following Sw, I supply पि after तत्रा of the MS. AL read simply तत्र. — (7) (*p*. 7, *l*. 4) The *Dīp*. drops तु. — (8) (*p*. 7, *l*. 5) Sw retains MS नकृत°. — (9) Sw wrongly reads ञ्नित्कृत° as क्नित्कृत°. The MS अन्तोदादिति (retained in Sw) is questionable. AL read अन्तोदात्त इति. By a minor emendation we can get °दात्तादीति (= °दि + इति), thus balancing तत्कृतम्. But the crux is the reading अन्तोदात्ता°. For, a nominal form ending in a *ñit* or *nit* suffix has an accent on the initial syllable (P. 6. 1. 199 : ञ्नित्यादिर्नित्यम्), not on the final one. So I have suggested आद्युदात्ता°. How such a serious error crept into the text, I do not know. — (10) विधेयेसति of the MS is split into विधेये सति by AL Sw. But this defeats the purpose of the text ('a *niyama* is understood when *vidhi* is *not* understood'). So I resort to an अकारप्रश्लेष (विधेयेऽसति). — (11) (*p*. 7, *l*. 8) The MS शब्दवत्यत्र लिंगं कार्य आश्री° is read as शब्दवति यत्र लिङ्गे (यत्) कार्यमाश्री° by AL and as शब्दवत्यत्र लिंगं कार्यमाश्री° by Sw. Obviously both AL and Sw think that an *anusvāra* is lost in MS, so that कार्य is to be understood as कार्यं=कार्यम् (because a vowel follows). I retain the MS reading as it is. Only I understand कार्य = कार्ये (the final being lost in Saṁdhi). Further I split शब्दवत्यत्र into शब्दवत् यत्र (strictly the writing in the MS should have been शब्दवद्यत्र, if at all the two words were to be written together). शब्दवत् qulifies लिङ्गम् and यत्र (= यस्मिन्) goes with कार्ये. — (12) (*p*. 7, *l*. 9). Both eds. read मुण्डादयः शब्दवन्तः (for the MS °योशब्द°). This is evidently wrong. अशब्दवन्तः is intended. So I resort to an अकारप्रश्लेष. — (13) The MS मुंडाद(? त)यो न कर्तव्यम् is corrupt. Sw emends it into मुण्डात् यो, but I do not know with what gain. Was the original reading something like मुंडेन तपो न कर्तव्यम् by any chance ? — (14) (*p*. 7, *l*. 10) Sw's emendation of the MS °संगास् into °संगस् is not necessary. — (15) I accept Sw's emendation of कालं into कार्यं, but लप्स्यन्ते is to be preferred to लप्स्यते.

[2. 6]

आवृत्तिसंख्यानात् is a part of the *Vār*. एकाजनेकाज्-ग्रहणेषु चावृत्तिसंख्यानात् (10) । This *Vār*. refutes the objection levelled above in *Vār*. 7 : एकाजनेकाज्ग्रहणेषु चानुपपत्तिः । The *Mbh*. which explains and illustrates the *Vār*. runs as follows : एकाजनेकाज्ग्रहणेषु चावृत्तेः संख्यानादनेकाच्त्वं भविष्यति । तद्यथा — 'सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो

भवन्ति ' इति । ' त्रिः प्रथमामन्वाह त्रिरुत्तमाम् ' इत्यावृत्तितः सप्तदशत्वं भवति । एवमिहाप्यावृत्तितोऽनेकाच्त्वं भविष्यति । The argument in this passage is that although there is only one *a* strictly in words like *ghaṭa* (because of अकारस्यैकत्वम् view), still considering that there are two occurrences of *a* in this word, we can say secondarily that the word is *dvyac*. So the rule concerned can apply and give us the desired form *ghaṭika*. A parallel is given from ritual. In a विकृतियाग seventeen *sāmidhenī* Ṛcs (i. e. Ṛcs to be recited when the faggots are placed on the sacrificial fire) are required. The Ṛcs prescribed are actually thirteen. So the number seventeen is made by reciting the first and the last Ṛcs thrice each.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 17) इह लोके यत्र मुख्या संख्या ... Evidently here is a gap in the text resulting into loss of the text. ' When the principle number (मुख्या संख्या) does not suit, a secondary (गौणाम्) number is resorted to so as to serve our purpose ' — some such idea seems to be intended. The eds. do not seem to be aware of the gap. [सप्तद]शत्वं संपद्यते etc. is a part of the parallel. — आवृत्तावनियतविषयायाम् : This gives the reason for the specific mention of त्रिः प्रथमाम् etc. The आवृत्ति is justified by लोकन्याय. But an authoritative text is required to tell you specifically which Ṛcs are to be repeated. After प्रथमोत्तमे supply ऋचौ. आवृत्तिसंख्ये is a Bahuv° compound.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 20) भवेदावृत्तितः कार्यम् : This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.*: भवेदावृत्तितः कार्यं परिहृतम् । इह तु खलु किरिणा गिरिणेत्येकाज्लक्षणमन्तोदात्तत्वं प्राप्नोत्येव । This *Mbh.* while accepting the preceding argument (in the case of *ghaṭa* : *ghaṭika*), points out that it is not useful in the case of the accent of words like *kiriṇā*. In the previous example dissyllabicness was the condition for affix *ṭhan*. Since that affix was desired, one could resort to the figurative number based on the occurrences or repetitions of *a*. But in the present case monosyllabicness is the condition mentioned for the high pitch on the final syllable. That condition is satisfied (on the अकारस्यैकत्वम् view). When a condition is satisfied on the principal sense of a term, it is improper to run to a figurative sense. That is what the *Dīp.* says in भवेदावृत्तितः कार्यं ... किरिणा गिरिणेति. आश्रीयते=उपाधित्वेन निर्दिश्यते. स्वाश्रयस्य : स्वं कार्यम्, तस्य आश्रयः, मुख्यमेकत्वम् तस्य. Cf. Nāg. : आवृत्तिकृतद्व्यच्त्वेन स्वगतैकाच्त्वस्य बाधाभाव इत्यर्थः ।

(*p.* 7, *l.* 21) एतदपि सिद्धम् : This is the *pratīka* which represents the following *Mbh.*: एतदपि सिद्धम् । कथम् ? लोकतः । तद्यथा — ऋषिसहस्रमेकां कपिलामेकैकशः सहस्रकृत्वो दत्त्वा तया ते सर्वे सहस्रदक्षिणाः संपन्नाः । एवमिहाप्यनेकाच्त्वं भवति । The moral of this anecdote is, as the *Dīp.* puts it : संख्या संख्यान्तरेणात्यन्तं निवर्त्यते, मुख्येन गौणेन वा. Similarly Kaiy. : लोके पूर्वा संख्या संख्यान्तरेण, मुख्येन गौणेन च बाध्यते.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 22) यथा शास्त्रे ... किमर्थमिदम् इति : Before dealing with the anecdote of the cow given away a thousand times, Bhar. first gives a parallel from

grammar itself to show how a subsequent number, primary or secondary, cancels the previous one. In the course of his commentary on P. 1. 1. 57 : अचः परस्मिन् पूर्वविधौ, Pat. explains the necessity of reading the word पूर्वविधौ in this rule. One of the reasons given is to secure the suffix *ḍhak* so as to form words like *naidheya*. The *Mbh.* here is as followes : अथ पूर्वविधाविति किमर्थम् ? हे गौः । बाभ्रवीयाः । नैधेयः । ... इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् । नैधेयः । आकारलोपः परनिमित्तकः तस्य स्थानिवद्भावाद् द्व्यज्लक्षणो ढक् न प्राप्नोति । पूर्वविधाविति वचनाद् भविष्यति ।

Here this is the position : The word *naidheya* ' a descendant of Nidhi ' is formed from *nidhi* with the addition of the affix *ḍhak* (=*eya*) according to P. 4. 1. 122: इतश्चानिञः (= इकारान्ताद् द्व्यचोऽपत्ये ढक् स्यात्, न त्विञन्तात् । *Sid-Kau.*) and forms a patronymic. Now, the word निधि is formed from नि+धा with a suffix कि (P. 3. 3. 92 : उपसर्गे घोः किः), when the radical *ā* is dropped by P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोप इटि च. So, when the suffix *ḍhak* is to come, the position of the stem is : *ni* + *dh* + *lopa* (substitute of *ā*) + *ki*. Is the word *nidhi* to be regarded as dissyllabic (as it is) or polysyllabic (*i*, *ā* [by स्थानिवद्भाव] and *i*) ? Evidently polysyllabic, if स्थानिवद्भाव is there, in which case the number three supersedes the number two. Since the stem is no more dissyllabic (द्व्यच्क), *ḍhak* is not available. That is why the word पूर्वविधौ is read in the rule. A substitute (say, *lopa*) of an original vowel caused by a following element is to be like the original (vowel), only if what immeditely precedes the original vowel is to undergo the operation concerned. The Vṛddhi operation is to be undergone by the *i* of *ni* (by P. 7, 2. 118 : किति च ।). This *i* does not immediately precede the original *ā*. Since there is no पूर्वविधि, there is no स्थानिवद्भाव and so the stem is not त्र्यच्क; it is द्व्यच्क. So *ḍhak* can come in, resulting into the desired form नैधेय.

The important point which is relevant here is the indication of the principle that a subsequent number sets aside the older number. If स्थानिवद्भाव were allowed here, the dissyllabic status of the stem would have been superseded by the polysyllabic one (सति स्थानिवत्त्वे त्र्यच्कोऽयमिति द्व्यच्कत्वे बाधिते ढकोऽप्राप्तिरिति ...). So to prevent the स्थानिवद्भाव Pāṇini specifically lays down the condition पूर्वविधौ. That principle will operate here also ; the stems *kiri* etc. (in *kiriṇā* etc.) will be regarded as dissyllabic, thus prohibiting the undesired final Udātta.

(*p*. 7, *l*. 24) ऋषिसहस्रमिति सामाना ... भुजिवत् इति : Bhar. here first grapples with a grammatical problem involved in the *Mbh.* construction ऋषिसहस्र ... ते ... संपन्नाः . The connection between the agent and the verb is direct if ऋषिसहस्रम् is dissolved as सहस्रं ऋषयः. Here ऋषयः directly goes with संपन्नाः. If, however, the compound is dissolved as ऋषीणां सहस्रम्, the connection becomes indirect. सहस्र is not directly connected with संपन्नाः, but though ऋषिs; the connection is not शाब्द, but only semantic (सामर्थ्यलक्षणः).

Note: The *Dīp.* reads एकैक इति साक्षात् संबन्धः. However it seems that संपन्ना इति साक्षात् संबन्धः is the intended text, because ऋषिसहस्रं संपन्नाः requires an explanation. Read also Kaiy.: ऋषिसहस्रमिति कर्मधारये [= सामानाधिकरण्ये of the *Dīp.*] संपन्ना इत्यस्य साक्षादृषिभिः संबन्धः। षष्ठीसमासे तु सामर्थ्यलक्षणः संबन्धो, यथा ब्राह्मणशतं भोज्यतामिति भुजेर्ब्राह्मणैः सह। — (*p.* 7, *l.* 26) ते हि परस्परं ... वस्तुतः परित्यागः।: This is intended to explain how the cow came back again to a Ṛṣi (to give her away again) once he had made a gift of it. He purchased her. (Similarly Kaiy.: वित्तेन क्रीत्वा प्रत्येकं दत्त्वा सहस्रदक्षिणा ऋषयः संपन्ना इत्यर्थः।) This is evidently meant to obviate the objection that what is given once cannot be accepted again as a gift. But the commentators point out another difficulty. Selling of a cow is prohibited for a Brāhmaṇa. How is then this purchase possible? — Leaving the problem to the legalists to fight over, we note significance of the parallel from the grammatical point of view. Just as one and the same cow can serve the purpose of a thousand cows, similarly one and the same vowel can be conveniently looked upon as many in view of its repeated occurrence. — सहस्रदक्षिणाः means one who has given away (*not* received) a thousand (cows), cf. सहस्रं दक्षिणा गोरूपा येषां दातॄणां ते (Nāg.). — 'सहस्रदक्षिणा आनीयन्ताम्' इत्येतेऽप्यानीयन्ते: This is a mannerism of Bhar. Cf. यथा देवदत्तशालायां ब्राह्मणा आनीयन्तामिति ब्राह्मण्या देवदत्तोऽप्यानीयते (*Dīp.* Crit. Ed. *Āhn.* VI, part I, *p.* 3, *l.* 24).

Here ends the discussion of the view: अकारस्यैकत्वम्. Kāt. and Pat. have so far examined the arguments for and against the view.[1]

Readings: (1) (*p.* 7, *l.* 20) MS अनेकत्वम् is read as अनेकाच्त्वम् and एकत्वम् as एकाच्त्वम् by AL. This is unnecessary. — (2) (*p.* 7, *l.* 24) MS किमिदर्थमिति is corrupt. — (3) (*p.* 7, *l.* 25) The MS reads from एकैकशः इति up to वित्तेन स्वीकृत्य twice. — (4) (*p.* 7, *l.* 27) The MS ददः is emended into ददते by AL and ददति by Sw. With the least change I read ददुः. — (5) I follow Sw in emending the MS दातुं into दानं.

[3]

आन्यभाव्यं तु कालशब्दव्यवायात् (*Vār.* 11): Having examined the arguments for and against the अकारस्यैकत्वम् view, Kāt. now takes up for examination the opposite view, viz. 'the plurality of *a*'. आन्यभाव्य means अन्यत्वम्, भेदः, or नानात्वम् (either अन्यस्य भावः अन्यभावः; then [ब्राह्मणादित्वात्] स्वार्थे ष्यञ्. Or अन्यो भावः अन्यभावः [अन्यद्वस्तु], तस्य भावः). The suffix *ya* seems to he redundant since Kāt. could well say merely अन्यभावः. (That is why Nāg. hastens to add: आन्य-

1. The *Dīp.* does not notice the *Mbh.* which refutes the objection द्रव्यवच्चोपचाराः. Even Kāt., who himself raised this objection, does not now say anything about it.

भाव्यमित्यस्यान्यत्वत्वमित्यर्थो न ... प्रतिप्रयोगमकारस्यान्यत्वमित्यर्थः।) After all Pat.'s dig at Kāt., viz. प्रियतद्धिता दाक्षिणात्याः, was not without reason.

The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* runs as follows : आन्यभाव्यं त्वकारस्य। कुतः? काल-व्यवायात् — दण्ड अग्रम्। शब्दव्यवायात् - दण्डः। न चैकस्यात्मनो व्यवायेन भवितव्यम्। भवति चेद्, भवत्यान्यभाव्यमकारस्य।

Bhar. explains and establishes the reasoning of Kāt. and Pat. on the strength of similar (साधर्म्येण) and dissimilar cases (वैधर्म्येण) — i. e. by showing (1) how there is a शब्दव्यवाय between two *a*-sounds as between two admittedly different sounds like *ṛ* and *i* (in *ṛti*, for example), and also कालव्यवाय (in दण्ड अग्रम्), again as between two admittedly different sounds like अइउण्. This is साधर्म्येण हेतुः. (2) The वैधर्म्येण हेतु consists in showing that two *a* sounds are open to कालव्यवाय and शब्दव्यवाय unlike a single *a* itself (uttered in isolation) which never admits this twofold व्यवाय.

(*p.* 8, *l.* 4) The MS clearly reads प्रसिद्धिनानात्वैः and प्रसिद्ध्येकत्वैः (accepted in the two eds.), but the intended meaning demands प्रसिद्ध° in both expressions. Cf. येषां सिद्धं नानात्वम् and प्रसिद्धनानात्वेषु further on in this section. प्रसिद्धनानात्व, sounds whose mutual difference or separateness is well known, as opposed to प्रसिद्धैकत्व.

(*p.* 8, *l.* 7) अयं धर्मः, i. e. शब्दव्यवाय. — शुद्धः, pure i. e. uttered in isolation. पौर्वापर्यं कालव्यवेतत्, temporal sequence (marked by earlier and later moments).

(*p.* 8, *l.* 11) ननु शब्दव्यवाये ... शब्दवांश्च : Here Bhar. makes an original point. Actually the two व्यवायs are not entirely different. You cannot show a case of a mere शब्दव्यवाय, where there is no कालव्यवाय also. So Kāt. should rather have said कालव्यवायात् only. Bhar. somehow justifies Kāt. by saying that what the latter really wants to say is that the कालव्यवाय is of two kinds : one pure, the other accompanied by sound(s). Similarly Kaiy. (*verbatim*) : यद्यपि शब्दव्यवायेऽपि कालव्यवायोऽस्ति, तथापि कालव्यवाय एव द्विधा दर्शितः — शब्दशून्यः, शब्दवांश्च।

[3. 1]

The *Vār. yugapad deśa*° etc. advances another argument in support of *akārasya ānyabhāvyam.* The *Mbh.* on this : युगपच्च देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनान्मन्यामहे — आन्यभाव्यमकारस्येति। यदयं देशपृथक्त्वेनोपलभ्यते — अश्वः, अर्कः, अर्थ इति। न ह्येको देवदत्तो युगपत् स्रुघ्ने च भवति, मथुरायां च।

Observation : Nāg. remarks : अर्कादिशब्दा[1] एव देशपदेनोच्यन्ते। Nāg. has no doubt understood the *Mbh.* correctly, but the question is whether Kāt. himself

1. Why not अश्वादिशब्दाः ?

meant this. It rather seems that the previous *Vār.* (... *kālaśabdavyavāyāt*) opposed the unity of *a* from a chronological point of view while the present one objects to it on a spatial point of view. Mere presence of *a* in different words like *aśva*, *artha* etc. does not necessarily prove the *deśapṛthaktva* of *a*. Thus, for example, if one and the same person were to utter the three words successively (or even if he were to utter simply *a a a*) without leaving his place, that will not prove the *deśapṛthaktva*. On the other hand, if many speakers, stationed in different places, were to utter the same word, say *aśva* (or even simply *a*) simultaneously, that would point to the plurality of the *a*-sounds. Nāg.'s own introduction to this *Vār.* is : विभुत्वं निराचष्टे - युगपच्च देशेति। This is further explained in the *chāyā* as : एवमेकत्वं निरस्य विभुत्वमपीत्यर्थः।

(*p.* 8, *l.* 14) The *Dīp.* अयमेकत्वविरोधी धर्मः specifically expresses the argument implicit in the *Vār.*

(*p.* 8, *l.* 15) The *Dīp.* अन्यस्त्वे हेतुद्वयमुपन्यस्तम् ... ण्ड इत्यत्र दृश्यते उपलभ्यते explains the *Mbh.* : यदि पुनरिमे वर्णाः शकुनिवत्[1] स्युः। तद्यथा — शकुनय आशुगामित्वात् पुरस्तादुत्पतिताः पश्चाद् दृश्यन्ते, एवमयमकारो द इत्यत्र दृष्टो ण्ड इत्यत्र दृश्यते। Here Pat. is refuting the argument that the *kālaśabdavyavāya* between the two *a* sounds (of words like *daṇḍa*) shows the plurality of *a*. A phoneme like *a*, says the *Mbh.*, is like a bird. A bird which is seen at one end, say the eastern end, of a flying row of birds, may be seen at the western end in another moment due to a quick flight. An onlooker almost sees that bird simultaneously at both ends. But does anybody think that there are actually two birds (intervened by the middle ones)? No. the same applies to our *a*. It is just one and the same *a*. Its interruption by the middle sounds (*ṇḍ*) is more apparent than real.

It is plain that Pat. does not advance any logical argument to counter the argument of the *Vār.* He simply suggests that just as in the case of a bird, belonging to a flying flock, there may be an appearance of two birds owing to his quick flight, similarly there may be just an appearance of two *a*-sounds. Actually there is only one. But the question is : what is there in a phoneme (corresponding to the quick flight of a bird) which creats the illusive appearance of two phonemes ? Pat. is silent.

It is here that the *Dīp.* comes in with a philosophical argument. A *varṇa* is revealed and not produced. The physical sound that is uttered is merely a manifestor. A *varṇa* is what it manifests. The manifestation of the phoneme is there as long as the manifestor — the physical sound — is there. When the manifesting sound is not there, the *varṇa* is no longer manifested. Consequently —

1. The words शकुनिवत् स्युः (and also आदित्यवत् स्युः which follow later) are taken as *Vār.* in some editions.

to come to our illustration of *daṇḍa* — when the speaker utters (the first) *a*-sound, there is the manifestation of the *varṇa a*. When he utters *ṇ* and *ḍ*, the manifesting *a* sound is no longer there (because the manifestors *ṇ* and *ḍ* are manifesting their own Varṇas then) and hence no manifestation of the *varṇa a*. When the speaker again utters the sound *a*, there is again the manifestation of the *varṇa a*. So, Bhar. concludes, what the opponent regards as the interruption of the *varṇa a*, is really the *interruption of perception of the varṇa a* (नायं वस्तुनो व्यवायः। किं तर्हि? व्यञ्जकस्य निमित्तस्य प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिभ्यामुपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धी एते।).

(*p*. 8, *l*. 15) हेतुद्वयम् = (1) कालशब्दव्यवायः, (2) युगपद् देशपृथक्त्वम्. भवता = आन्यभाव्यवादिना. — (*p*. 8, *l*. 17) शकुनिवत्: On this Nāg. remarks: तत्र शकुनिवदिति दृष्टान्तस्य तद्रूपरिच्छिन्नत्वे न तात्पर्यम्, तन्मते तस्य विभुत्वात् ...। — (*l*. 18) वस्तुनः = वर्णस्य. (*l*. 19) अभिव्यञ्जकनिमित्तत्वम्. This should really be °निमित्तम् (i. e. sounds). — (*l*. 24) पूर्वमनुपलब्धः, not perceived previously (at the western end when the bird was at the eastern one). — (*l*. 25) The *Dīp*. paraphrases दृष्टो by उपलब्धः and दृश्यते by उपलभ्यते. This seems unnecessary. But Bhar. may have done it on purpose, in order to make clear that दृष्टो and दृश्यते do not have their literal meaning of visual perception here, but of perception or cognition in general.

Observations: (1) It is unfortunate that in an important discussion like this (which, moreover, occurs for the first time in the *Mbh*.), where he supplies a logical background to Pat's vague discussion, Bhar. does not make clear how exactly he distinguishes between *a* as a physical sound and *a* as a *varṇa*. All that he says is that a *varṇa* is *vyaṅgya* 'to be manifested'. He evidently means by it a speech-sound in some sort of a universal form, something like a 'type' sound, for which I have used the word 'phoneme'. He also speaks of *vyañjaka* 'manifestor', but he does not say what it is. Perhaps he leaves it for us to infer that physical 'sounds' are meant to be these manifestors. It is important to note that even Bhar. does not call here the manifested *varṇa* by the name of *sphoṭa*; Kaiy. however calls it as such and, further, particularises it in the present context as *vyaktisphoṭa* 'a single manifested [word]entity'.

(2) As hinted above Kaiy. entirely follows Bhar. in the explanation of the *Mbh*. here. Read: कालशब्दाभ्यां व्यञ्जकानां ध्वनीनामेव व्यवायो, न व्यङ्ग्यस्येति व्यक्तिस्फोटवादिनो भावः। यथा शकुनिः पङ्क्तेरादौ स्थित आशुसंचारात् तदन्ते भवति, एवं व्यञ्जकध्वनिसंनिधानासंनिधानाभ्यामकारस्योपलम्भानुपलम्भाविति भावः।

(*p*. 8, *l*. 26) नैवं शक्यम्। अनित्यत्वमेवं स्यात् (which refutes अकारस्य एकत्वम्) is actually the *pratīka* of the *Mbh*. which is followed there by: नित्याश्च शब्दाः। नित्येषु च शब्देषु कूटस्थैरविचालिभिर्वर्णैर्भवितव्यम्, अनपायोपजनविकारिभिः। यदि चायं द इत्यत्र

दृष्टः ण्ड इत्यत्र दृश्येत, नायं कूटस्थः स्यात्। Bhar. ignores the point about the *kūṭastha-nityatā* raised in the *Mbh.* Instead he attacks the problem from a different angle. In the *Dīp.* शास्त्रे ह्यर्थवतः ... भिन्नैरेव वर्णैरनुगता इति (*p.* 8, *l.* 27–*p.* 9, *l.* 4), he argues thus : Grammar declares that words are eternal. This eternality belongs only to meaningful words. Meaningful words (whether *pada*-s or sentences) are regarded as groups of phonemes. Meaningfulness belongs to wholes, not to individual phonemes. Now if the single-entity theory about phonemes is accepted, then the traditionally accepted groups or wholes will lose their identities. A word like *karka* will be reduced to the form *kar* (because on the single-entity view, the phonemes *k* and *a* will be occurring twice), which latter will not be able to convey any meaning. It will, therefore, no longer be *nitya*. To avoid this, *akārasya ekatvam* or single-entity view of phonemes has to be rejected and *ānyabhāvyam* (plurality) of phonemes is to be accepted (तस्मादभ्युपगन्तव्यमेतत्, अवस्थिता एवामी समुदाया अर्थेषु, भिन्नैरेव वर्णैरनुगता इति).

(*p.* 8, *l.* 26) अस्त्ययं तर्काश्रितः समाधिः. This refers to the argument that a phoneme is like a bird. — (*l.* 27) शास्त्रे ह्यर्थवतः शब्दस्य नित्यत्वं प्रतिज्ञातम्. The eternality of word is declared, for example, in the very first *Vār.* in the *Mbh.* (*siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* ... etc.). However, I do not know where it is specifically said that only a meaningful word is eternal. Perhaps this is only deduced from the association of *śabda* with *artha* in that *Vār.* — (*l.* 28) स च समुदायोऽभ्युपगतः शास्त्रे ; in grammar, only a whole (and not a part) is accepted as meaningful. Cf. the *Vār.* संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्च (*p.* 33, *l.* 6) — (*p.* 9, *l.* 1) स वर्णसमुदायः, that (i. e. old, established) combination of phonemes. — (*p.* 9, *l.* 4) अवस्थिताः, fixed, specific. After अर्थेषु, a word like वर्तन्ते is understood.

(*p.* 9, *l.* 4) यदि तु पुनरमी वर्णा आदित्यवत् स्युः. The full text of the *Mbh.* refered to by this *pratīka* is : यदि पुनरिमे वर्णा आदित्यवत् स्युः । तद्यथा — एक आदित्योऽनेकाधिकरणस्थो युगपद् देशपृथक्त्वेषूपलभ्यते । This challenges the argument of the *Vār.* युगपच्च देशपृथक्त्वदर्शनात्. The sun is seen in different regions, but his unity remains intact. The same could be the case of *a* also. The comm. *Chāyā* explains (in all seriousness !) : स (आदित्यः) तावदेक इति सर्वसंमतम्[1] । तस्य चानेकत्रोपलम्भ इति निर्विवादम् । तद्वदत्रापि ... — (*l.* 6) the passage तत्राकारो देवदत्ते नरात्मनि पुनरादित्ये नेति विषमहेतुः is unintelligible.

The parallel of the sun to support oneness of *śabda* already occurs in the *Mīm-Sū.* 1. 1. 15 : आदित्यवद्यौगपद्यम् । The Bhāṣya of Śabara on this reads : यत्त्वेकदेशस्य सतो नानादेशेषु युगपद् दर्शनमनुपपन्नमिति । आदित्यं पश्य देवानांप्रिय । एकः सन्ननेकदेशावस्थित इव लक्ष्यते । कथं पुनरवगम्यत एक आदित्य इति । उच्यते । प्राङ्मुखो देवदत्तः पूर्वाह्णे

1. The author probably forgot the discussion about the oneness of the sun in the *Śaba-Bh.* (कथं पुनरवगम्यते एक आदित्य इति etc.) quoted above.

संप्रति पुरस्ताद् आदित्यं पश्यति । तस्य दक्षिणतोऽवस्थितो न द्रौ पश्यति, आत्मनश्च संप्रति स्थितं तिरश्चीनं देवदत्तस्यार्जवे । तस्मादेक आदित्य इति ।

(*p*. 9, *l*. 7) विषम उपन्यासः. This represents the *Mbh.*: विषम उपन्यासः । नैको द्रष्टा आदित्यमनेकाधिकरणस्थं युगपद् देशपृथक्त्वेपूपलभते । Here the protagonist of plurality of *a* says that आदित्यवत् स्युः is a fallacious argument. It is true that the sun is seen to be in more than one place simultaneously. But the important point is that the sun is not so seen by any *one* person. Only *many* persons, stationed in different places, see the sun so. On the other hand, in the case of *a*, even a single person can perceive *a* in different places. The parallel of the sun will not do. The *Dīp.* एतदाचष्टे ... पलभते explains this *Mbh.*

मया=अकारस्य आन्यभाव्यवादिना । — एवं मयोक्तम् practically means : 'What I meant to say'. The protagonist of the plurality of *a* says that the parallel of the sun brought in by the opponent (*ekatvavādin*) is exactly similar to his own parallel of Devadatta. No *one* person sees the sun, as well as Devadatta, simultaneously at different places. It cannot prove the oneness of *a*. — (*l*. 9) अकारं पुनरुपलभते — After this, एको द्रष्टा अनेकाधिकरणस्थम् is to be supplied in the *Mbh.* (as Nāg. does).

(*p*. 9, *l*. 9) यस्यापि च क्षण ... यौगपद्यस्य संभवात्. A fundamental point is anticipated at this stage in the discussion. Apart from whether *a* is perceived simultaneously in different places, or not, the question is : Are many simultaneous cognitions, i. e. cognitions at one and the same moment, possible at all ? There can be a view, at least prima facie legitimate, that only one cognition is possible at any one given moment. If it is so, the objection based on the simultaneous perception of *a* in many places falls to the ground. A reply to such a possible objection is given in the *Dīp.* here. Bhar. here says that even on this view, although many simultaneous cognitions may not be possible at any one moment, they are possible in a little longer stretch of time, such as a *muhūrta*. The difference in the two kinds of perception, i. e. of the sun and of *a*, will be then obvious, says Bhar. This point is, however, just mentioned in the *Dīp.*, there is no elaboration of it.

(*p*. 9, *l*. 11) न चाकाशमेकम् ... नुपपन्नम्. The protagonist of the plurality of *a* continues. Here he anticipates an argument of the opponent, viz. that ether (*ākāśa*) is one and indivisible. There are no parts in it. The whole of the *ākāśa* is, so to say, one region of *a*. So one cannot say that *a* is perceived in different regions. This objection is here simply brushed aside, without assigning any reason.

(*p*. 9, *l*. 12) अकारमपि नोपलभते. Here also, as in the previous case, एको द्रष्टा अनेकाधिकरणस्थम् is to be supplied. Two reasons are given in the *Dīp.* यद्य-

कारस्य भेदाः ... दर्शनात्' इति. (1) *a* is one and indivisible. (2) The ether also is one and indivisible (contrary to the assumption of the opponent). — The *Mbh.* text श्रोत्रोपलब्धि ... भिज्वलितः quoted in the *Dīp.* is followed, in the original, by : आकाशदेशः शब्दः । एकं च पुनराकाशम् । The thrust of this *Mbh.* passage is the assertion : आकाशदेशः शब्दः and the conseqnent one : एकं च पुनराकाशम्. If the adjective आकाशदेशः alone is relevant, why are others mentioned ? According to the *Dīp.*, the object is to show that आकाशदेशः is as much an essential characteristic of *śabda* as श्रोत्रोपलब्धिः etc. (अव्यभिचारिणां धर्माणां प्रदर्शनार्थम् । ... एवमाकाशमव्यभिचारि ।). According to Kaiy. the expression श्रोत्रोपलब्धिः is to prove the ether as the location of *śabda*. This is how he proves it — rather elaborately : आकाशप्रदेशविशेषस्य श्रोत्रत्वात्, इन्द्रियाणामसंबद्धविषयाग्रहणात्, श्रोत्रस्य च निष्क्रियत्वाद् गमनाभावाद् आकाशदेशत्वमस्य (= शब्दस्य) अभ्युपेयम् । The *Dīp.* (*l.* 17) practically states *dhvani* ' physical sound ' as the manifestor of *śabda* when it says : ध्वनिना व्यज्यमानो न प्रदीपादिभिरभिव्यज्यते which is evidently a gloss on : प्रयोगेणाभिज्वलितः. Kaiy. says it in so many words : प्रयुज्यत इति प्रयोगः ध्वनिः, तेनाभिव्यक्तः ।

(*p.* 9. *l.* 18) नान्यभाव्यमकारस्य. Missing in the MS. I have supplied this as the possible conclusion (indicated by *tasmāt* ' so, therefore '. — या त्वेकदेशस्य सतः ... प्रवर्तन्त एवेति. Having thus established that *a* is a single entity, the protagonist of unity now proceeds to explain the illusion of *a* having many locations. Bhar. assigns this appearance to the instrumental cause (?) (*nimittakāraṇavaśāt*), by which he probably means the manifesting sounds. (But why does he not say so expressly ?) Bhar. gives a parallel. We speak of *śabda* as being distant or near. Actually it is the physical sound which is near or distant. Another instance given in the *Dīp.* is that of an echo. Though actually the sound produced is only one, it is heard more than once; similarly the cognitions produced by the activity of physical organs (speech and auditory) are such as create the appearance of many in the place of one. — It must be said that Bhar. seems to be unnecessarily vague on this point. Kaiy.'s explanation is clear-cut : देशभेदेन तु प्रतिभासो भिन्नदेशावस्थितपुरुषोदीरिताभिव्यञ्जकध्वनिकृतः । Perhaps his explanation is influenced by that of Śabara on the *Mīm-sū* 1. 1. 15 (mentioned above) which particularly contains the word *vyāmoha* ' illusion '. Read : तस्मादेक आदित्य इति । दूरत्वादस्य देशो नावधार्यते । अतो व्यामोहः । एवं शब्दे ऽपि व्यामोहादनवधारणं देशस्य ।

(*p.* 9, *l.* 22) इदं त्वयोक्तम् ... व्यवहारः प्रवर्तिष्यते. The protagonist of the oneness of *a* now refutes a parallel previously brought in by the opponent. It was said by the advocate of plurality of *a* that Devadatta, whose oneness is self-evident, is not seen simultaneously in two different places e. g. Srughna and Mathurā. The *Dīp.* is somewhat corrupt here but it seems that the very statement that Srughna and Mathurā are two different places is challenged here. After

all, the earth is one whole; its specification as Srughna at some point and as Mathurā at another is artificial, based on some extraneous adjuncts. Similarly with ether also. Its oneness is intrinsic, its plurality, depending on some external factors, which does not destroy its intrinsic unity. It is possible that Bhar. here had the concept of *upādhi* 'external adjunct' in mind but, if he had it, he does not say so expressly. Nāg. does. Read : औपाधिको भेदस्तु आकाशस्येव न शब्दस्याप्येकत्वे बाधकः। Here ends the argument of the protagonist of the oneness of *a*.

(*p*. 9, *l*. 25) आकाशदेशा अपि बहवः. This *pratīka* of the *Mbh*. is followed in the original by : यावता बहवः, तस्मादान्यभाव्यमकारस्य. This concludes the argument of the protagonist of plurality of *a*. There is simply a dogmatic assertion in the *Mbh*., without any attempt to justify it. It is the *Dīp*. which advances an explanation. It first raises an objection against it and then answers it itself. — ननु च पृथिवी ... पुनराकाशम्. This *Dīp*. raises the objection : The earth is a product. It has its constituent parts which build it. We can speak of those parts as different places or regions. But the ether is not a product. It has no constituent parts. How can then one speak of आकाशदेशाः ? The *Dīp*. from सत्यम्। एवमेव upto the end of this section answers this objection and confirms the view : अकारस्य आन्यभाव्यम्. The passage is not quite clear. It seems to say that the case of the earth and that of the ether are not so radically different from one another as they appear to be. Even in the case of an admittedly *samavāya* relation e. g. that between the earth and its parts, the parts are not essentially the same (*atadātman*) as the whole. Still they are called 'regions, locations' of the earth. What is wrong, then, if objects like trees etc, which, because of their contact with ether, seem to particularise it are regarded as dividing the ether into so many parts ? That seems to be the line of argument in the *Dīp*., though, as said above, it is far from being clear. The translation is only tentative.

A note on the sequence of two passages :

Two small passages ill suit the context where they are actually read in the MS. They do not make any sense there and even conflict with the tenor of the argument in the context in which they occur. They are : (1) न चाकाशमेकम्। तस्मात् एकदेशत्वमकारस्यानुपपन्नम् (*p*. 9, *ll*. 11–12). In the MS this occurs after एवमाकाशमव्यभिचारि। तस्मात् (MS fol. 35 B, line 8 = this ed., *p*. 9, *ll*. 17–18). This passage denies the unity of ether and so it conflicts with the preceding and following sentences which state the एकदेशत्व of the ether. I have therefore removed it and placed it tentatively after मुहूर्तविषयस्य उपलब्धिविषयस्य संभवात् (*p*. 9, *l*. 11). (That in the place of this sentence I have supplied नान्यभाव्यमकारस्य is already stated above.) (2) आकाशदेशा अपि बहवः (*p*. 9, *l*. 25). In the MS this occurs after बुद्धयो ह्यनवस्थिताकारा एव प्रवर्तन्ते (MS fol. 35 B, *l*. 10 = this ed. *p*. 9, *ll*. 21–22). This passage also similarly contradicts the view put forth in the preceding

and following lines and so I have shifted it suitably after देशबहुत्वव्यवहारः प्रवर्तिष्यते (*p.* 9, *ll.* 24-25). How the two passages came to occupy their place in the MS, I cannot say.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 7, *l.* 20) The MS [अ]नेकचम् is better read as अनेकत्वम् than अनेकाच्त्वम् which latter is preferred by AL. — (2) (*p.* 7, *l.* 24) MS किमिदर्थमिति is read as किमर्थम् इति by Sw, as °र्थमिदमिति by AL. It must be noted that इदम् is not found in the *Mbh.* — (3) AL drop तद्यथा. — (4) (*p.* 7, *l.* 25) AL °त्रिकरण्यन्. — (5) (*p.* 7, *l.* 27) MS ददु, AL ददते, Sw ददति. The adopted text ददुः involves a lesser change. — (6) MS दातुं, AL दातुं. The दानं (adopted text) as in Sw. — (7) (*p.* 8, *l.* 4) For प्रसिद्धिनानात्वैः and °द्ध्येकत्वैः of the MSALSw, see above, *Notes.* — (8) (*p.* 8, *l.* 5) Sw unnecessarily emends सिद्धं and दृष्टः into सिद्धः and दृष्टम् ('इह शब्दव्यवायो येषां सिद्धः नानात्वं तेषां दृष्टम् । '). Sw's construction is no doubt smooth, but Bhar. does not always show solicitation for smoothness. And, anyway, the intended meaning is also had from the construction as it is. — (9) (*p.* 8, *l.* 7). I have supplied ऽयं before धर्मः, to make the expression specific : 'this property' (= *śabdavyavāya*). — (10) (*p.* 8, *l.* 8) AL (unnecessarily) शब्दस्य (for the MS शब्देन). — (11) (*p.* 8, *l.* 9) MSSw दृष्टः. — (12) MS ह्य(?)स्योच्चारण-, AL स्वस्यो°, Sw (न) हि अस्यो°. शुद्धस्यो° is my emendation. — (13) (*p.* 8, *l.* 10) MS दंडाग्रम् inspite of the qualifying word असंहितायाम्. The old eds. follow it. — (14) (*p.* 8, *l.* 13) The *Mbh.* युगपच्च देश°. — (15) (*p.* 8, *l.* 18) AL वस्तुना. — (16) (*p.* 8, *l.* 22) The MS reads clearly पंजरावस्थित, and Sw has accepted that reading. At first sight it appears quite natural in the context of *śakuni*, but I think that is exactly why the scribe was deceived. पञ्जरावस्थित cannot be accepted because the quick flight (आशुसंपातित्वात्) is not so possible in a cage as in the open air. On the other hand, the sequence of sounds (particularly written letters) brings to our mind the picture of birds flying in a line (*paṅkti*). Hence पङ्क्त्यावस्थितः. — (17) (*p.* 8, *l.* 23) with an *akārapraśleṣa* Sw reads वस्तुतोऽभिन्नः. This means : " Is it possible to say that the one — which is really identical with the other — is concealed by another ? ' The adopted text means : ' Is it possible to say that it is concealed by another ? ' It does not make much difference ultimately. — (18) (*p.* 9, *l.* 1) Five letters are damaged after कर्क in the MS. Sw reads कर्कस्त्वर्णसमुदायो, AL कर्कः । स वर्ण° (which I follow). — (19) (*p.* 9, *l.* 2) Sw करु. — (20) (*p.* 9, *l.* 3) MS °लक्षणोश्यवप्रयोगा° (corrupt.). AL's reconstruction is correct and so is followed here. — (21) (*p.* 9, *l.* 4) The original *Mbh.* reads : यदि पुनरिमे etc. — (22) (*p.* 9, *l.* 10) Sw उपलब्धा. — (23) (*p.* 9, *l.* 11) MS अमुहूर्तविषयस्योपलब्धियौगपद्यस्यासंभवात्. — (24) (*p.* 9, *l.* 19) MS दूरादेव्यपदेव्यपदेशः, AL दूरादेत्यपदे व्यप°, Sw दूरादेः व्यप°. The second व्यपदे in the MS is evidently an inadvertent repetition of the scribe. — (25) MS दूरेशस्सनि°, AL दूरेस्थः संनि°. — (26) (*p.* 9, *l.* 26) MS सव्यमेवमेव तत्.

[4]

In this *Vār*. Kāt. advocates the *ākṛti* view (the view that a word denotes a class). According to this view *a* and *ā* belong to one and the same class of sounds. When P. mentions *a*, he mentions all the varieties of *a*, which include *ā* also. Naturally an operation taught for *a* will hold good automatically for *ā* also. So, if this view is adopted, difficulties pointed out above [2] in the case of rules like *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32) and *yasyeti ca* (P. 6. 4. 148) disappear.

(*p*. 10, *l*. 3) प्रत्याहारे = अक्षरसमाम्नाये. Although the term प्रत्याहार usually means grammatical terms like अण्, अक् etc., it is also used for the अक्षरसमाम्नाय on which अण्, अक् etc. are based. — (*p*. 10, *l*. 4) व्यक्त्युपादानं तु ... न स्पृशति. If Pāṇini utters some particular variety of a phoneme in order to teach some operation, there is no emphasis on that particular variety. Some particular variety has to be resorted to for utterance, that's all. It is an *upalakṣaṇa*, standing for the whole class. In order to illustrate the notion of class Bhar. gives a curious example of a practice in some नालिकेरद्वीप (Cocoanut Island) where, we are told, one shall not touch a bull with one's foot. When the resident of that island warns a stranger about this practice, the individual bull which he shows to the stranger as not to be so touched may happen to be young, dark and lean. Still the stranger understands that even an old, variegated and fat bull is not to be touched with one's foot. This is how the class view or the universalistic view works. — One is amused to see Bhar. going to the far off Nālikera island with its remarkable custom to illustrate the common concept of आकृति or जाति.

नालिकेरद्वीप — I do not know which particular island is meant. I am aware of only one literary reference to it, viz. in the Yuan Chwang's travel accounts. Read : ' The account in the records proceeds to relate that over the sea some thousands of *li* to the south of the [Sêng-ka-lo or Simhala] country was the Na-lo-ki-lo-chou (for Nālikila- or Narikira-dvīpa, " Cocoa-nut Island ").' The account further says that the inhabitants of this island were dwarfs (just three feet high), with human bodies and bird-beaks. It is further said there that they did not raise any crops and subsisted on cocoanuts. (*On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India* by Thomas Watters, edited after his death by T. W. Rhys Davids and S. W. Bushell, Vol. II, p. 236, publ. London, Royal Asiatic Society, 1905. See also *Travels of Hiouen-Thsang* (Vol. IV, p. 446) by Samuel Beal where (foot-note 36) he suggests that Narakira may perhaps be the Maldive islands. But he is not dogmatic about it). — An expression नारिकेलद्वीपवासिन् occurs in the प्रमाणपद्धति of जयतीर्थ (page 53), ed. S. R. Panchamukhi, Karnatak Historical Research Society, Dharwad, 1982.

(*p.* 10, *l.* 6) तस्यास्त्वाकृते ... व्यवच्छेदो वा. This shows that the *ākṛti* view is free from the defect of *vyavāya* which was pointed out above in the case of the Single-Phoneme (अकारस्यैकत्वम्) view. Although an *ākṛti* is an obstract thing and so is incapable of having properties like openness, still these latter belong to concrete individuals and we can secondarily ascribe them to the *ākṛti*. — (*p.* 10, *l.* 7) तत्र प्रत्याहारे ... सिध्यति. This sums up the case of the *ākṛti* view. It is the whole class of *a* which is declared to have been read as open in the Pratyāhāra-sūtra (*a i u ṇ*). This whole class is reverted to its natural closed pronunciation in the last rule of the *Aṣṭ*. When Pāṇini teaches *ī*-substitution for a in certain environment (P. 7. 4. 32), it applies to *ā* also because of the universalistic view. So no difficulty about *asya cvau* (P. 7. 4. 32).

(*p.* 10, *l.* 8) यत्र त्वाकारग्रहणे ... विषये स्मृतः इति. This *Dīp.* discusses a context where the *ākṛti* view in likely to cause some difficulty by reason of its alleged over-application and finally shows that no undesired result will actually take place. When Pāṇini mentions *ā* in a rule, the rule should theoretically apply undesiredly to *a* also because of the *ākṛti* view. But if Pāṇini had really meant this, he would have actually said *a* itself. That would have served his purpose equally well and, additionally, it would have secured *lāghava* (*a* is short, *ā* long). Still, if Pāṇini uses *ā*, it means *ā* only ; *a* is to be excluded. यथा पूर्वया ब्राह्मणः प्रत्युत्थेयः provides a parallel.

But a doubt persists. True, *a* can thus be avoided, on the strength of *lāghava*, or *ākāroccāraṇasāmarthya*, when Pāṇini utters *ā*. But what about the pluta *a*(3) ? That cannot be got rid of by this argument. Bhar. points out that the Ślokavārttika *plutaś ca viṣaye smṛtaḥ* (on P. 6. 1. 87) which says that the pluta *a*(3) actually occurs only there where it is specifically taught (e. g. when returning a salutation [P. 8. 2. 83], in calling from a distance [84] etc.) takes care of it. Even the generality offered by the *ākṛti* view is unable to extend the scope of pluta beyond its specifically mentioned contexts. Cf. Kaiy. for the whole discussion : अकारजातिः सर्वप्रदेशेषु निर्दिश्यते। नानन्तरीयकस्तु व्यक्तिनिर्देशः। तत्र प्रत्याहारेऽकारजातेर्निर्देशात्, तस्याश्च विवृतत्वप्रतिज्ञानाच् छास्त्रान्ते च तस्या एव प्रत्यापत्तिविधानम्। तदेवं जातिनिर्देशादनुवृत्तिनिर्देशस्थेनाकारेण ग्रहणमाकारस्य सिद्धम्। 'अष्टन आ विभक्तौ' इत्यत्र तु सत्यपि जातिनिर्देशे दीर्घोच्चारणसामर्थ्याद् ह्रस्वस्य ग्रहणं न भवति। अन्यथा ह्रस्वमेवोच्चारयेत्। 'प्लुतश्च विषये स्मृतः' इति न्यायात् प्लुतस्याग्रहणम्।

[4. 1]

The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* 'तद्वच्च तपरकरणम्' reads thus : एवं च कृत्वा तपराः क्रियन्ते, आकृतिग्रहणेनातिप्रसक्तमिति। Bhar. explains that तद्वच्च of the *Vār.* means the same thing as तथा च 'hence'. The two expressions are synonymous. — The *Dīp.* ग्रहणेनातिप्रसक्तम् represents the *Mbh.* : ननु च सवर्णग्रहणेनातिप्रसक्तमिति कृत्वा

तपराः क्रियेरन्. This is an objection against तद्वच्च तपकरणम्। How can you say that the तपरकरण is a strong evidence pointing to the unavoidableness of the *ākṛti* view? The तपरकरण is for restriction, a safeguard against over-application of a rule. It may point to a possible over-application owing to the सवर्णग्रहण as well. The तपरकरण does not necessarily imply आकृतिग्रहण.

This is followed in the *Mbh.* by the reply : प्रत्याख्यायते तत् 'सवर्णेऽण्ग्रहणमपरिभाष्यमाकृतिग्रहणादनन्यत्वाच्च' (P. 1. 1. 69 *Vār.* 8). This passage (not noticed in the *Dīp.*) says that तपरकरण must be understood as meant for avoiding over-application caused by आकृतिग्रहण, since Kāt. is going to declare under P. 1. 1. 69 that *aṇ* should be deleted from P. 1. 1. 69 : *aṇ udit savarṇasya cāpratyayaḥ* as it becomes superfluous when the *ākṛti* view is adopted. The तपरकरण remains useful on the *ākṛti* view also.

(*p.* 10, *l.* 13) प्रत्याख्यातेऽपि हि ... ग्रहणमिति. Although this appears under the *Mbh. pratīka* सवर्णग्रहणेनातिप्रसक्तम् it is not an explanation of the *Mbh.* passage as such. This *Dīp.* only adds another argument why the *ākṛti* view has to be adopted. It serves two purposes : (1) you can dispense with the word *aṇ* in P. 1. 1. 69 (योगे = 'अण्' रूपे योगैकदेशे ; Kāt. proposes to delete only the word *aṇ*, not the whole Sūtra 1. 1. 69). But this is not all. There is another aspect. (2) Just looking at P. 1. 1. 70 : *taparas tatkālasya*, you cannot decide the exact function of तपरकरण. There are two possibilities. (i) If one adopts individualistic view of meaning (व्यक्तौ पदार्थे), then, if Pāṇini uses a pure *ā*, it cannot include, say, a nasal *ā* ($\tilde{\bar{a}}$), even if it be desirable sometimes. The addition of *t* can serve, according to P. 1. 1. 70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य, to invest (प्रापकम्) the uttered *ā* with a power to include in it $\tilde{\bar{a}}$ also. (ii) If one adopts a universalistic view of meaning (आकृतौ पदार्थे), then, an *a* uttered by Pāṇini can include *ā* also. But sometimes this may not be desirable, to prevent which (निवर्तकम्) तपरकरण can be useful. So the exact purpose of तपरकरण (explained in P. 1. 1. 70) remains doubtful (संदिह्यत एव). The *Dīp.* अतो यथैवाकृति ... ग्रहणमिति decides the issue. Since the rejection (प्रत्याख्यानम्) of *aṇ* in P. 1. 1. 69 by Kāt. depends on the *ākṛti* view, it should be logical to understand that in the case of तपरकरण also the universalistic view be accepted. In other words it is आकृतौ निवर्तकम्. As usual Kāiy's remark is very brief : तत्र न्यायेनाकृतिपक्षस्य स्थापितत्वात् तपरेष्वपि स एव पक्षः स्थित इत्यर्थः।

Observation : Keeping the rule P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित् सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः intact, the question whether तपरकरण is *prāpaka* or *nivartaka* depends on whether one continues the reading of *aṇ* in the following P. 1. 1. 70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य. If one continues it, then it is *nivartaka* (on the maxim सिद्धे सति पुनर्ग्रहणं नियमार्थम्) since even for the *aṇ* vowel furnished with *t* the *savarṇagrahaṇa* is already achieved by P. 1. 1. 69. If, however, one does not effect the *anuvṛtti*, then the

taparakaraṇa makes the rule injunctive (प्रापकम्). The *Mbh.* discusses the relative merits of these two views under P. 1. 1. 70. Read : किं पुनरिदं नियमार्थम् आहोस्वित् प्रापकम्? कथं च नियमार्थं स्यात्, कथं वा प्रापकम्? यद्यत्राण्ग्रहणमनुवर्तते, ततो नियमार्थम्। अथ निवृत्तम्, ततः प्रापकम्। कश्चात्र विशेषः? 'तपरस्तत्कालस्येति नियमार्थमिति चेद् दीर्घग्रहणे स्वरभिन्नाग्रहणम्' (वा. १)। ... स्वरभिन्नानां ग्रहणं न प्राप्नोति। केषाम्? उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानाम्। अस्तु तर्हि प्रापकम्। 'प्रापकमिति चेद् ध्रस्वग्रहणे दीर्घप्लुतप्रतिषेधः' (वा. २)। ... 'विप्रतिषेधात् सिद्धम्' (वा. ३)। अण् सवर्णान् गृह्णातीत्येतदस्तु तपरस्तत्कालस्येति वा, तपरस्तत्कालस्येत्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन। अण् सवर्णान् गृह्णातीत्यस्यावकाशः — ह्रस्वा अतपरा अणः। 'तपरस्तत्कालस्य' इत्यस्यावकाशः — दीर्घास्तपराः। ह्रस्वेषु तपरेषूभयंप्राप्नोति, 'तपरस्तत्कालस्य' इत्येतद् भवति विप्रतिषेधेन [I. 180. 21–181. 7].

In our passage Bhar. does not make any reference to the *anuvṛtti* of *aṇ* in P. 1. 1. 70 although he touches the प्रापकत्व versus निवर्तकत्व point. It is also remarkable that under P. 1. 1. 70 neither Kāt. nor Pat. brings in the *ākṛti* view in connection with the तपरकरण. This of course does not mean that the *ākṛti* view is here discarded. Probably the whole discussion under P. 1. 1. 70 proceeds in the *Mbh.* 'without prejudice' to what is said here in the Pratyāhāra Āhnika.

[4. 2]

The *Mbh.* on the *Vār.* हल्ग्रहणेषु च reads as follows : किम्? 'आकृतिग्रहणात् सिद्धम्' इत्येव। 'झलो झलि (पा. ८. २. २६)। अवात्ताम् अवात्तम् अवात्त। यत्रैतन्नास्त्यण् सवर्णान् गृह्णातीति।

The present *Vār.* mentions a context where the adoption of the *ākṛti* view is simply inevitable. The सवर्णग्रहण by P. 1. 1. 69 is alright in the case of vowels. But what about consonants where that rule fails (तत्र ग्रहणकशास्त्रस्याव्यापारः)? There is no provision for them in Pāṇini (except कु, चु, etc.). So, when सवर्णग्रहण of consonants is intended, there is no other go. This is what comes out of adopting the *vyakti* view implied in P. 1. 1. 69. The *Mbh.* illustrates this by citing forms like अवात्ताम् etc. (*s*-Aor. 3rd pers. dual etc.) of *vas-*.

The constituents of this form can be stated thus : *a* + *vās* (< *vas*, P. 7. 2. 3), + *s*(*sic*) + *tām*. At this stage the final *s* of *vās* is replaced by *t* (P. 7. 4. 49 : सः स्यार्धधातुके) making the radical form *vāt*. After this, the *s* (of *sic*) which finds itself between two *t* sounds is elided by P. 8. 2. 26 : झलो झलि, thus giving the final form अवात्ताम्. Here the question of the individualistic or the universalistic view of a phoneme comes in in connection with the elision of *s*. The elision requires that *s* should be between two *jhal* sounds. Now the *t* as read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya is included in *jhal* all right. But on the individualistic view, the *t* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya can represent only one actual *t*, whichever you may choose. The result is that you can regard the *s* here as either preceded or followed by a *jhal* phoneme, but not both. Consequently P. 8. 2. 26, which

is पूर्वपराश्रय (पूर्वझल्-परझलाश्रय) cannot operate. – (*p*. 10, *l*. 17) प्रत्याहारे = अक्षरसमाम्नाये. तत्रत्य must refer to the actual sound (like *t*) as occurring in grammatical elements (like roots).

(*p*. 10, *l*. 19) क्व तर्हि ? ... अबुद्धाः इति. This contains a possible objection and a reply to it. If, on the *vyakti* view, only one instance can be called *jhal*, then P. 8. 2. 26 will never find any scope anywhere, for it requires two *jhal* sounds for its operation. And so the framing of the rule will be useless. No, says Bhar. The rule will still find scope where the preceding and the following phonemes are unidentical *jhal*-s (like *t* and *th*, *d* and *t*, *dh* and *th* etc.). अबुद्ध (derived from अ + बुध् + स् + त), अबुद्धाः are instances in point.

Kaiy. almost echoes the *Dīp*. Read : अवश्याश्रयणीयत्वमाकृतिपक्षस्य दर्शयति । व्यक्तिपक्षे ह्येकस्यैव तकारस्यानुकरणं खफछठथेत्यत्र तकार इति द्वयोस्तकारयोर्झल्त्वं न स्यात्, अपि त्वेकस्यैवेति 'अवात्ताम्' इत्यत्र सिज्लोपो न स्यात्, 'अभित्थाः' इत्यादावेव स्यात् । Nāg. gives the process of arriving at *avāttām* thus : अवात्तामिति । वसेर्लुङ्, तसस्ताम्, सिच्, 'सः सि ...' इति तत्वम् (i. e. तादेशः), 'वदव्रज ...' इति वृद्धिः, 'झलो झलि' इति सलोपः ।

— आकृतिनिर्देशे etc. states the moral.

Readings: (1) (*p*. 10, *l*. 3) तु is not found in the *Vār*. as read in the *Mbh*. — (2) (*p*. 10, *l*. 4) The MS नालिकेनद्वीपनिवासिनः is read as नालिकेन द्वी° by Sw, as नालिकेरद्वी° by AL. I adopt नालिकेर°, but I emend °निवासिनः into °निवासिना. Sw further emends उपदिश्यते into °श्यन्ते which is of course not necessary for our text. — (3) (*p*. 10, *l*. 14). The MS संह्यत evidently requires emendation. Sw reads संगृह्यत. I follow संदिह्यत of AL. — (4) (*p*. 10, *l*. 15) °कृतिर्ग्रहणं of the MS is read as °कृतिग्रहण° by AL, as °कृतेर्ग्रहण° by Sw (followed in this ed.). — (5) (*p*. 10, *l*. 17) Both the older editions read a *daṇḍa* after निर्दिष्टः, following the MS. I have removed it because निर्दिष्टः and प्रत्याहारे (= प्रत्याहारे निर्दिष्टः) are syntactically connected. — (6) (*p*. 10, *l*. 18) I propose to read वा for च of the MS (retained in both the older editions).

[4. 3]

The *Mbh*. on the *Vār*. रूपसामान्याद्वा reads as follows : रूपसामान्याद्वा सिद्धमेतत् । तद्यथा 'तानेव शाटकान् आच्छादयामः, ये मथुरायाम् ।' 'तानेव शालीन् भुञ्ज्महे, ये मगधेषु ।' 'तदेवेदं भवतः कार्षापणम्, यन् मथुरायां गृहीतम् ।' अन्यस्मिंश्चान्यस्मिंश्च रूपसामान्यात् तदेवेदम् इति भवति ।

Bhar. gives two alternative explanations of this *Mbh*. passage. (1) The first one (attributed by him to 'some') is given in यद्यप्याकृति ... व्यवायो भवति. This passage is somewhat corrupt but its main thrust is not very difficult to make out. According to this interpretation, the *ākṛti* view is not indispensable. The similarity of forms is a powerful factor which makes one ignore minor differences and look upon the two things as one and the same in spite of their

actually being two different things. A person borrows a rupee from a friend and returns the money after some time, saying : ' Here is your rupee which I borrowed from you last week '. Actually the rupee which was borrowed is different from the one which he is now returning. That one was spent already. What he is returning is a different coin. Still the two are looked upon as one and he same (अन्यस्मिंश्चान्यस्मिंश्च तदेवेदमिति भवति) because of the रूपसामान्य (and also the sameness of value, we must add). The very nature of things (अर्थवस्त्वेव) is such that the feeling of sameness persists (तत्त्वाव्यवायो भवति) when two things have a ccmmon form. This being the case the sound *a* in P. 7. 4. 32 : *asya cvau* etc. will be looked upon as identical with *ā* and consequently there will be no difficulty for it in conveying *ā* also. So no difficulty about forms like *mālībhavati*. (Apparently there is no need, on the रूपसामान्य view also, to first identify *a* in *asya cvau* etc. with *a* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya and thus grant it the power of सवर्णग्रहण (P. 1. 1. 69) because of its now-acquired *aṇ*-status. The *a* can directly and immediately convey *ā* also. The *ākṛti* view need not be there (एवं न तावत् शब्दाकृतिरिति ।). Cf. Kaiy. : व्यक्तिनिर्देशेऽपि भेदापरामर्शेन लोकवद् अभेदव्यवहारोऽस्तीति सिद्धम्। व्यक्तिव्यतिरिक्तं तु सामान्यं भवतु मा वा भूत्, सर्वथा लोक इव शास्त्रे व्यवहार इति भावः — Nāg. on this : ' अभेदव्यवहार ' इति । सादृश्यनिबन्धनप्रत्यभिज्ञाकृताभेदव्यवहार इति भावः । अल्पमहत्-स्थूलकृश-ह्रस्वदीर्घ-गोघटादिषु ' गौः ' ' घटः ' इत्यादिव्यवहारवदिति भावः। ... ' मा वेति '। अनुगतप्रतीतिव्यवहारयोः सादृश्येनैवोपपत्तेरिति भावः। सादृश्यं चात्र समानध्वनिकृतम् ।

(2) The second interpretation (attributed by Bhar. to अत्रभवन्तः — again, we do not know to whom Bhar. refers by this appelation) extends from आकृतेरेव रूपसामान्यात् (*p*. 10, *l*. 25) up to the end of this section. According to this interpretation, Kāt. again falls back on the *ākṛti* view. However, this *ākṛti* view is different from the *ākṛti* view resorted to previously (4). There the *ākṛti* was regarded as expressed (*abhidheya*) directly by the word. Here the *ākṛti* does not form a part of the meaning of a word as such. Then how is it known ? रूपसामान्यात् is the reply. Thus *a* may convey only *a*, and *ā* may convey only *ā* by word-power as such. Still, looking at the रूपसामान्य — i. e. कण्ठ्यत्व ' velarness ' — between the two one is inclined to put the two in one class (*ākṛti*). The रूपसामान्य thus serves to draw your attention to the common class of the two (although this is no longer regarded as forming a part of the meaning). Thus, on the strength of this variation of the *ākṛti* view also, *a* can convey *ā*. For a similar view, cf. :

आनन्त्येऽपि हि भावानामेकं कृत्वोपलक्षणम् ।
शब्दः सुकरसंबन्धो न च व्यभिचरिष्यति ॥ (तन्त्रवार्त्तिक ३. १. ६. १२)

(*p*. 10, *l*. 25) आकृतेरेव रूपसामान्यात् सिद्धम्. Here आकृतेः is to be probably regarded as continued (along with a *vibhaktivipariṇāma*) from the *Vār*. 13.

The construction seems to be : रूपसामान्यात् ज्ञातायाः, उपलक्षितायाः वा, आकृतेः आकृति-हेतोः, इष्टं सिद्धम् । — तत्रैतत् ... सिद्धमिति. An objection raised in order to make the difference between the two आकृति views clear. — I have reconstructed कर्तुं of the MS as उक्तम्. वक्तुं स्यात् is not good Sanskrit while उक्तम् suits the grammar and the intended idea perfectly well. — (*p*. 10, *l*. 26) तच्च न ... एवमपि सिद्धम् gives the explanation. The meaning in which Bhar. uses (twice) the word चोद्यमान° ' being expressed, conveyed ' is rather unusual. Similarly उपदिश्यन्ते ' are taught ' also is to be understood in the sense ' are understood '. The *Dīp*. from इदं तावद् onwards is an ellucidation of the argument. — इदं तावदयं प्रष्टव्यः. Imitation of the typical Bhāṣya style. Here the third person (अयं) is practically equivalent to the second person. — (*p*. 11, *l*. 2) यदेतद् अन्यत्वम्. एतद् ' this ', that is between *a* and *ā*. — किमेतद् उच्चारणात् शब्दस्य. Rather a vague sentence. What seems to be meant is to ask whether the pronunciation of *ā* is radically different from that of *a* as, for example, that of *i* ? Is this a case of a difference of kind, or just that of degree ? The opponent says that he regards *ā* as different from *a* because of a particular feature (विशेषात्), — he does not say which, but evidently length is intended. (That both have velar articulation as सामान्य, common, is tacitly admitted.) स एवायम् ··· प्रतिपद्यते. A generalisation meant to support the opponent's contention that *ā* is different from *a*. Note that here the expression तत्त्वान्यत्वे is not Nom. dual, but locative sing — it is विषयसप्तमी (तत्त्वं चान्यत्वं च तत्त्वान्यत्वम्, a Samāhāra Dvandva ; तस्मिन् [विषये]). निमित्तात्=भेदनिमित्तात् धर्मात् ' owing to some differentiating (factor or property) '. — With एवं चेत् begins the सिद्धान्तिन्'s final rejoinder. If there is something common between two things, and also something different, why should one emphasize the difference and say that the two are different ? Why should not one rather emphasize the common feature(s) and say that the two things are essentially one ? The latter view, further, is not opposed to the practice of the world. On the contrary it is in agreement with it as the *Mbh*. illustrations show. So, the Siddhāntin concludes, although not expressly denoted by the word (अनभिधीयमानापि) there is such a thing called *ākṛti* which is responsible for the feeling of identity (तत्त्वस्य प्रतिपत्तौ).

I have emended तस्य प्रत्यापत्तौ to तत्त्वस्य प्रतिपत्तौ. तस्य is out of place here because there is no masculine or neuter substantive nearby which it could qualify. Similarly प्रत्यापत्तौ is out of question here. The understanding (प्रतिपत्ति) of identity is meant here. Alternatively, तस्य may be retained, as referring to अभेदस्य (line 6, which conveys the same meaning, though it is rather away).

Readings : (1) (*p*. 10, *l*. 22) The passage from यथा कार्षापणा° ... up to एवं न is considerably corrupt. Sw retains it entirely. I have to leave some portion untranslated. I propose to read °व्यवायो (for °ये). Another emendation (rather bold) is to read न (for च) as required by the context. — (2) (*p*. 10,

ll. 25–26) The MS कवतुं is read as ववतुं by the older editions. I emend it to उक्तं (see Notes above). — (3) (*p.* 11, *l.* 2) Following the older editions, I read अकारादयम् (for °दय of the MS). (4) (*p.* 11, *l.* 8) For emendation of तस्य प्रत्यापत्तौ into तत्त्वस्य प्रतिपत्तौ, see the Notes above.

r̥l̥K / 2

Summary : The only point discussed in this section is the necessity or otherwise of reading the phoneme *l̥* in this Sūtra. Kāt. first suggests three purposes which are served by the inclusion of *l̥* here. Afterwards he and Pat. try to see whether these purposes can be served even without reading *l̥* in this Śiva-sūtra.

[1]

The *Mbh.* किं विशेषेण लृकारोपदेशश्चोद्यते ? refers to the preceding sentence in the *Mbh.* : अथ लृकारोपदेश: किमर्थ: ? with which the discussion in the *Mbh.* opens.

The word विशेषेण is explained in two ways in the *Dīp.* as meaning : (1) 'in particular, specifically' and (2) 'in a different way' (वैधर्म्येण). The first is implied in the *Dīp.* उक्तं हि प्रयोजनं ... मर्हति, the second in अन्ये हि वर्णा: etc. A question was raised about the open articulation of *a*. A different place will be proposed for *r*. But the very reading of a phoneme itself in the Akṣarasamāmnāya is not questioned elsewhere. Why this exception in the case of *l̥* then ? That is the point.

(*p.* 11, *l.* 12) रेफहकारौ पूर्वपरोपदेशेन. The question whether *r* be read where it is (हयवरट्) or earlier, after *h* (*हरयवट्) is discussed in the *Vār*-s 4 and 5 under the Śiva-sūtra हयवरट् ; the question of reading *h* either at the earlier place or at the later place alone is discussed there in the *Vār*-s 1–3. The question of the purpose of reading the *antasthā*-s in the Pratyāhāra *aṇ* is also discussed in the *Mbh.* under the sūtra हयवरट्.

The *pratīka* अल्पीयांश्च प्रयोगविषय: represents the following *Mbh.* which explains the question : अथ लृकारोपदेश: किमर्थ: ? The *Mbh.* runs as : अयमस्ति विशेष: । अस्य हि लृकारस्याल्पीयांश्च प्रयोगविषय: । यश्चापि प्रयोगविषय: सोऽपि क्लृपिस्थस्यैव । क्लृपेश्च लत्वमसिद्धम् । तस्यासिद्धत्वादृकारस्यैवाच्कार्याणि भविष्यन्ति । नार्थं लृकारोपदेशेन । The point made here is that *l̥* is extremely rare in Sanskrit. Whatever little occurrence of *l̥* there is, it is restricted to the forms of the root *kl̥p*. But even here, Pāṇini reads the root not with *l̥* (i. e. as *kl̥p*) but with *r̥* (i. e. as *kr̥p*, cf. कृपू सामर्थ्ये P. Dh. I. 799), and teaches the substitution of *l* and *l̥* in the place of *r* and *r̥* of *kr̥p* in P. 8. 2. 18 : कृपो रो ल:. Now since this rule is in the Tripādī it is *asiddha* with regard to the earlier rules which teach vocalic operations.

The questioner now says that since *ḷ* of *kṛp* is *asiddha*, the *ṛ* which is there will undergo operations first, and then, after the operations are effected, *l* / *ḷ* will be substituted in the place of *r* / *ṛ*. Since now there is no difficulty about the vocalic operations (अच्कार्याणि), where is the need for reading *ḷ* in the Akṣara-samāmnāya ?

(*p.* 11, *l.* 15) अल्पीयानिति. The comparative degree is evidently intended to merely indicate the extremely limited use of *ḷ*. The commentators like Bhar., however, think that a comparison is intended. The sphere of the use of *ḷ* is all the more limited or less (अल्पीयान्). Less than whom ? Less than *ṛ* whose field is little (अल्प). But अल्प 'less' is a relative word. Whose field is characterized by largeness ? Probably of vowels like *a*. So *a* e. g. is very frequent. As compared with it *ṛ* is little frequent, while in comparison with it *ḷ* is still much less frequent. Kaiy. also remarks similarly. Read : ऋकारापेक्षः प्रकर्षः । ऋकारस्याल्पः प्रयोगस्ततोऽप्यस्याल्पतर इत्यर्थः... तत्र ऋकारावस्थायामेवोदात्तादिषु कृतेषु 'स्थानेऽन्तरतमः' इति स्थानिसदृशः (= उदात्तादिः) ऌकारो भविष्यति । The उदात्त is specifically mentioned as an अच्कार्य because no phoneme which is not *ac* can become Udātta (cf. P. 1. 2. 28-29 : अचश्च । उच्चैरुदात्तः etc.). Incidentally, instead of अतिशायन 'excellence, eminence etc.' of Pāṇini (5. 3. 55), Bhar. uses प्रकर्ष because that is how it is paraphrased by Pat. Read *Mbh.* on P. 5. 3. 55 : अतिशायन इत्युच्यते, किमिदमतिशायन इति ? देश्याः सूत्रनिबन्धाः क्रियन्ते। यावद् ब्रूयात् प्रकर्षेऽतिशय इति तावदतिशायन इति । — In the *Dīp.*, the expression अवर्णविषयः is not very satisfactory. ऋवर्णापेक्षः (as in Kaiy.) was expected.

[1. 1]

The *Mbh.* on the *Vār.* ऌकारोपदेशो यदृच्छाशक्तिजानुकरणप्लुत्याद्यर्थः begins as follows : ऌकारोपदेशः क्रियते, यदृच्छाशब्दार्थोऽशक्तिजानुकरणार्थः प्लुत्याद्यर्थश्च । यदृच्छाशब्दार्थस्तावत् — यदृच्छया कश्चिद् ऌतको नाम । तस्मिन्नच्कार्याणि यथा स्युः — दध्य् ऌतकाय देहि, मध्व् ऌतकाय देहि, उदङ्ङ् ऌतकोऽगमत्, प्रत्यङ्ङ् ऌतकोऽगमत् । चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः — जातिशब्दा गुणशब्दाः क्रियाशब्दा यदृच्छाशब्दाश्चतुर्थाः ।

The *Vār.* mentions three purposes or reasons (*artha*) for which the reading of *ḷ* is necessary : (i) For the यदृच्छाशब्दs. The definition of a यदृच्छाशब्द follows in the *Dīp.* For the time being it may be roughly understood as a word between whom and its object denoted there is no organic connection. The *Mbh.* gives the illustration of a word *ḷtaka*, a name given arbitrarily to a person. The *ḷ* of this word behaves as a vowel, causing a *yaṇ* (i. e. *y*, *v*, *r*, *l*) substitute for a preceding *ik* (i. e. *i*, *u*, *ṛ*, *ḷ*). To account for such operations, an *ac* status is necessary for *ḷ* in this word *ḷtaka*, which can be had by the ऌकारोपदेश. (2) A word ऋतक could be mispronounced as ऌतक by a person of defective speech. When this word ऌतक is quoted by somebody else, there also the initial *ḷ* will be-

have as a vowel. So again an *upadeśa* of *ḷ* is necessary. (3) With reference to certain operations like *pluti* (prolation) taught in P. 8. 2. 82 ff. : वाक्यस्य टेः प्लुत उदात्तः etc. *ḷ* substitution taught in P. 8. 2. 18 is *not* असिद्ध; it is *siddha*. So you cannot rely upon *ṛ* undergoing those operations for the sake of *ḷ*. If *ḷ* has to undergo them, it has to be an *ac*, for which again its Upadeśa is necessary.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 20) यदुक्तम्, प्रयोगार्थं शास्त्रम् etc. This is a reply to the objector's statement that there is no *ḷ* outside the derivations of *kḷp*. How are you so sure ? There is the name *ḷtaka*, for instance. (*p*. 11, *l*. 22) यदृच्छा नाम ... सा यदृच्छा is the definition of *yadṛcchā*. Normally when words convey objects, they do so through some property possessed by the object. This property may be of the nature of *jāti*, as when a particular animal is called *go* ' bull ', or ' cow ', because it possesses *gotva* ' bullness, or cowness ' (whatever it may be); or it may be spoken of as *śukla* ' white ' because it has white colour; or as *cala* ' moving ' because of its movement. These properties viz. the bullness, white colour, and the movement are called *pravṛttinimitta* of the words *go*, *śukla* and *cala* with reference to the particular animal. Because the properties like bullness are there, so the words like ' bull ' are applied to the animal; if the properties had not been there, these words would not be applied to it. The words *go*, *śukla* and *cala* are termed *jātiśabda*, *guṇaśabda* and *kriyāśabda* respectively because their *pravṛttinimitta*-s are *jāti*, *guṇa* and *kriyā* respectively. But apart from these classes of words, a fourth class is also recognized, where there is no property in the object as such which would correspond to the expression for the object. When, for example, our bull is named Ḍittha, there is no property inherent in the animal (unlike the white colour or the movement) which is responsible for that name. The only reason responsible for the name Ḍittha is the sweet will (*yadṛcchā*) of the naming authority. This *yadṛcchā* itself is the *pravṛttinimitta* of Ḍittha, if you wanted one. And so such a word is called a *yadṛcchāśabda*. Only, this प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त is not *arthagata*, it is *vaktṛgata*. Also, while the *jāti* etc. are significant and natural, *yadṛcchā* is arbitrary as the very word implies.

Such words are usually proper names (like Ḍittha), which have sometimes no etymological meaning. That is why Nāg. says : एवं च स्वेच्छया एकस्यां व्यक्तौ संकेत्यमानः शब्दो यदृच्छाशब्द इति बोद्धव्यम्. This is, however, one kind of यदृच्छाशब्द. When even other kinds of words (like *go*), having one kind of प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त, are used with disregard to it, that is another kind of यदृच्छाशब्द, for which see below. With Bhar's definition, cf. the one given by Kaiy. : अर्थगतं प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमनपेक्ष्य यः शब्दः प्रयोक्त्रभिप्रायेणैव प्रवर्तते स यदृच्छाशब्दो डित्थादिः।

(*p*. 11, *l*. 23) प्रवर्तकं निवर्तकं वा ... हेतुमन्तरेण. The presence of a property like *gotva* is a *pravartaka niyamahetu*. It sanctions the application (प्रवृत्ति) of a particular word to convey a particular object. On the other hand the absence

of a property, e. g. of bullness in a horse, is a *nivartaka niyamahetu*. It prevents the use of a word (e. g. 'bull') to denote that object (e. g. a horse). But this applies only in the case of the first three classes of words, जातिशब्द etc. A यदृच्छाशब्द is above these considerations. The only reason why it applies (*pravartate*) to a particular object, but not to another (*nivartate*) is the sweet will, *yadṛcchā*, of the speaker. — (*p.* 11, *l.* 24) डित्थशब्दो हि ... निवर्तते. — This illustrates the statement made in the previous sentence. स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धनः – Every word has two aspects. Primarily it is based on its form, the phonetic form (*svarūpa*), the sound sequence it consists of. But, in addition, it is connected with a certain meaning, a property belonging to the reference. A यदृच्छाशब्द, however, is स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धन; it is not जात्यादिनिबन्धन in addition, unlike the words *go* etc. The sentence इदं तावदस्य नामधेयं करोमीति spells out the *yadṛcchā*.

Observation : It seems that some words have been lost in the MS between तत्र तत्र and निवर्तते. The MS as it is reads : डित्थशब्दो ... यत्र यत्र प्रयुज्यते, 'इदं तावदस्य नामधेयं करोमी 'ति तत्र तत्र निवर्तते. This is evidently exactly the opposite of what must have been intended by the author. There is no doubt that यत्र यत्र प्रयुज्यते, ... तत्र तत्र प्रवर्तते must have been the original reading. So I have added प्रवर्तते after तत्र तत्र. A corollary of this is : यत्र यत्र न प्रयुज्यते, 'इदं तावदस्य नामधेयं करोमी 'ति, ततस्ततो निवर्तते. To signify this I have simply supplied a word अन्यतश्च before निवर्तते. But it could be any other word (or words) meaning the same thing. The omission of प्रवर्तते । अन्यतश्च is probably hapl. (प्रवर्तते ... निवर्तते).

(*p.* 11, *l.* 25) स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धनानां च ... न प्रयुज्यते. One more aspect of the *yadṛcchāśabda*-s is brought out here. In the case of the other kind of words an incorrect word (like *gāvī*) is set aside by the corresponding correct word (like *go*), provided the meaning is the same. There is no such possibility of words like Ḍittha being set aside by any other word. The reason is that no other word can have the same phonetic form as of Ḍittha etc., which alone forms the *pravṛttinimitta* (स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धनानाम्). The point behind this statement is to make it clear that nobody can say that words like *ḷtaka* will be set aside by the correct words and consequently there is no need of ऌकारोपदेश. Cf. Kaiy. : गाव्यादीनां तु गवादिभिर्निवर्तितत्वादसाधुत्वम् । ऋतकशब्दस्त्वर्थाश्रयेणैव विनियुक्त इति ऌतकशब्दस्यानिवर्तकः ।

(*p.* 12, *l.* 2) यदि तत्रास्ति ... अच्कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते. The protagonist of the *ḷkāropadeśa* makes one reservation. He admits that if the *Vār*. ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः (P. 1. 1. 9. 5) is accepted, then there is no need for reading *ḷ* here. For, with homogeneity with *ṛ* available on the strength of that *Vār*., *ḷ* can undergo vocalic operations, thus making the Upadeśa of *ḷ* here superfluous. But there is one thing. As far as Pāṇini is concerned, he reads *ḷ* in the Akṣara-

samāmnāya because he has not taught homogeneity of *ḷ* with *ṛ*. Cf. Kaiy. : 'ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिर्' इत्यस्य वार्त्तिककारवाक्यत्वात् सूत्रकारेणानाश्रितत्वादत्र ऌकारोपदेशः कृतः।

(*p.* 12, *l.* 4) चतुष्टयी शब्दानां ... अस्ति पौरुषेयत्वमिति। In the *Dīp.* upto कर्तुरस्मरणादत्र three characteristics of the regular words (like *go*, *śukla* etc.) are given : (1) Their meaning is fixed. *Go*, for instance, can only mean 'bull, cow'. (2) They have synonyms (*paryāya*) which are fixed. Synonyms for a word like *śukla* are *dhavala* etc. (3) These words are not man-made. There is no tradition, for example, who first ruled : 'The word *go* shall mean an animal possessed of a dew-lap, tail etc.'. In अस्ति तु स शब्दग्रामो ... व्यापारेण नियुज्यते Bhar. contrasts the *yadṛcchāśabda*-s (like *Ḍittha*) with these words. (1) They are not restricted to any particular meaning, since the meaning depends upon the sweet will of the user. (2) It is man-made, and (3) they do not have synonyms (cf. the *Dīp.* above : स्वरूपमात्रनिबन्धनानां च शब्दानां तस्य स्वरूपस्य रूपान्तरेण प्रत्याययितुमशक्यत्वान्नास्ति निवर्तकं शब्दरूपम्।).

[1. 2]

(*p.* 12, *l.* 8) तत्र जातिशब्दो यदा ... क्रियाशब्दो वा. In this passage Bhar. illustrates how one and the same word can be used in different but linguistically allied meanings and how, consequently, its grammatical designation differs. In this process he shows how a word, whatever its original *pravṛttinimitta*, is reduced to the status of a *yadṛcchāśabda* also. Now we are already acquainted with one kind of *yadṛcchāśabda* viz. the proper names like *Ḍittha* coined arbitrarily. So the *yadṛcchāśabda*-s which are now spoken of (which are not proper names) evidently form another category of the *yadṛcchāśabda*. It is therefore somewhat strange that Bhar. does not say so specifically; he silently introduces this topic, as though it were a simple continuation of the previous topic.

(*p.* 12, *l.* 8) तत्र जातिशब्दो यदा ... द्रव्यमस्य, द्रव्यशब्दः. A word is normally called a *jātiśabda* when it is used with reference to an individual on account of that *jāti* inhering in that individual (यदा तु द्रव्ये ... प्रवर्तते). In a sentence like देवदत्तो ब्राह्मणोऽस्ति 'Devadatta is a Brāhmaṇa', for example, the word *brāhmaṇa* is applied to Devadatta because he possesses the *jāti* Brāhmaṇaness. But this word can be used to denote the pure class or the universal (Brāhmaṇaness) itself (without bringing in the tangible individuals), as e. g. in the sentence ब्राह्मणो वन्दनीयः 'Brāhmaṇaness, i. e. the whole class of Brāhmaṇas, is adorable'. What is the designation of the word *brāhmaṇa* in such a sentence ? It is to be remembered that Brāhmaṇaness is the *pravṛttinimitta* for the use of the word *brāhmaṇa* with reference to an individual who possesses that attribute; it is not the *pravṛttinimitta* when the Brāhmaṇaness itself is to be denoted. What shall we

call the word in that context ? Bhar. says that since no *pravṛttinimitta* (like *jāti* etc.) is required here (तदानपेक्षितनिमित्तवत्त्वात्) we can call it a *yadṛcchā-śabda* because here also such a use depends upon the sweet will of the speakers, though of a somewhat different kind (अस्त्यत्रान्या पौरुषेयी प्रवृत्तिः).

The sentence यथा जातेरस्तित्व ... स्रष्टुमिति is not clear. — यदा त्वभिधेयं द्रव्य-शब्दः. When the word *brāhmaṇa* serves as a proper name of somebody, then the word is called a *dravyaśabda*. (But then, can it not be equally called *yad-ṛcchāśabda* ?).

(*p.* 12, *l.* 12) एवं गुणशब्दोऽपि ··· धायित्वाद् गुणशब्दः. In a sentence like शुक्लो रमणीयः 'the white (colour) is lovely' the word *śukla* denotes whiteness in general (गुणसामान्य). Like the similar *jāti*-word, it is called *yadṛcchāśabda*. In a sentence like शुक्लः पटः 'a white cloth' it denotes the cloth as possessing 'whiteness' and so it is there called a *jāti-śabda*. In a sentence like पटस्य शुक्लः 'the white (colour) of the cloth' (cf. Eng. usages like 'the green of the trees') it denotes a particular white colour (गुणाभिधायित्वात्), and so it is called a *guṇa-śabda*. Bhar. does not say anything about the use of the word *śukla* as a proper name of an individual. But judging by what he has said about the similar use of a *jāti*-word, he would evidently call it a *dravyaśabda*. — (*p.* 12, *l.* 14) एवं क्रियाशब्दः ... जातिशब्दः क्रियाशब्दो वा does *not* mean : '(a word of activity), when it denotes an activity is (called) either a *jāti*-word or an activity-word'. In fact क्रियायां जातिशब्दः and क्रियाशब्दो वा are two independent sentences (with *vā* in the sense of *ca*) and give the status of a *jātiśabda* and a *kriyāśabda* in two different contexts, after they are magnified with additions of relevant words. The sentence क्रियायां जातिशब्दः should really read : यदा क्रिया निमित्तापेक्षया द्रव्ये प्रवर्तते तदा जातिशब्दः (cf. similar statements in connection with *jāti*-words and *guṇa*-words above). An example of a *jāti*-word would be देवदत्तः पाचकः 'Devadatta is a cook'. Similarly क्रियाशब्दो वा should read : क्रियाभिधायित्वात् क्रियाशब्दश्च. An example would be ओदनस्य पाकः (we cannot use the word पाचकः here !). When the word *pācaka* is used for a cook in general, as in पाचको वञ्चकः 'a cook is a cheat' it is to be called a *yadṛcchāśabda*. We can similarly add that if a person is named *pācaka*, then it will be a *dravyaśabda*. — यावति च शब्दे ... तिङन्तेषु च states that every word which has an element of activity, is to be called a *kriyāśabda*, whether a primary noun (*kṛdanta*) or a finite form (*tiṅanta*).

(*p.* 12, *l.* 17) अन्ये मन्यन्ते ... प्रतिलभन्ते इति. Probably the view of the Mīmāṁsakas who hold that *jāti* is the basis of the conventional meaning in every kind of a naming word is referred to here. According to this view even words expressive of qualities (*guṇa*) and actions (*kriyā*) do so because of a universal inhering in these qualities and actions. The white, for example, is of different kinds : white of milk, white of the snow, white of the moonlight, white of the

conch and so on. All these whites are really different from one another. Still they get a name common to all the whites, viz. white (*śukla*), because all of them possess a universal viz. whiteness. The word *śukla* has this whiteness as the *pravṛttinimitta* and so it denotes all kinds (i. e. shades) of whiteness alike. — The word प्रत्यास is not very happy. It would suggest that *jāti* is not any real entity, it is just a fictitious entity which, obviously, is not intended.

(*p*. 12, *l*. 18) अपरे मन्यन्ते ... भेदिका इति. According to the view mentioned here, there is no connection between word and meaning. Every use of every word is arbitrary (*yadṛcchā*). All that the *jāti*-s etc. do is to differentiate one kind of *yadṛcchā*-word from another. — It is not known who held this view.

(*p*. 12, *l*. 19) अतस्तिसृषु ··· पौरुषेयत्वमिति. After this detailed discourse and references to other views, Bhar. comes back to the main point that in the matter of *yadṛcchā*-words (चतुर्थ्यां शब्दप्रवृत्तौ) the speaker has the freedom (पौरुषेयत्वम्) to use any word in any sense, although with reference to the other three modes of word-usage a specific word has to be used and a specific meaning alone is conveyed (नियतशब्दत्वं नियतार्थत्वं च).

Observation : The *Dīp*. तत्र जातिशब्दो यदा जातौ ... जातिशब्दः, क्रियाशब्दो वा (*ll*. 8–15) raises an important question about the exact interpretation of the *Mbh*. चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः। जातिशब्दा गुणशब्दाः क्रियाशब्दा यदृच्छाशब्दाश्चतुर्थाः। The *Mbh*. passage is usually taken to mean that there are four classes of words; some words are only *jātiśabda*-s, some only *guṇa-śabdas* and so on. But Bhar's treatment of the topic here suggests that he does not regard the four classes as watertight. Words are not divided into these exclusive classes, but rather that what character a word has is to be decided every time on the basis of the different role it plays in different contexts. Bhar. also seems to have widened the domain of *yadṛcchāśabda*-s from arbitrary names like *Ḍittha* to any word which is arbitrarily used in other than its usual character. It is difficult to say whether Bhar. subscribes to this interpretation alone or whether he has given it as an additional or alternative interpretation of the *Mbh*. passage. However, his use of words like यदा जातिशब्दः or एवं गुणशब्दोऽपि। शुक्लादिः or एवं क्रियाशब्दः in this very passage clearly shows that it cannot be ignored that some words *are* basically either *jāti*-words, or *guṇa*-words etc. So it may be that all that Bhar. wants to say is that although having primarily this or that character, the word is not permanently bound to any one class and that its nomenclature is likely to change in accordance with its use in different contexts.

Kaiy. has completely ignored this interpretation, but a faint echo is met with in Nāg. Read the Uddy. (on this *Mbh*. itself) : तत्र यदृच्छाशब्दो नाम वक्त्रा स्वेच्छया संनिवेशितः। स च अनेकविधः। एकव्यक्तिसंनिवेशितो डित्थादिरेकः। तत्र न किंचिद्-

तिरिक्तं प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तम् । आनन्त्यव्यभिचारयोरभावात् । किं तु शक्यस्यैवार्थस्य विषयताद्वयेन (i. e. प्रकारताविशेष्यतेतिविषयताद्वयेन) भानम् । तदुत्तरत्वादेः प्रकारत्वावच्छिन्नः स एवार्थः (i.e. डित्थत्वम् = डित्थत्ववत्त्वम्) । यद्वा शब्दपराद् वाच्येऽर्थे एव त्वादिः (i. e. डित्थत्वम् = डित्थपदवाच्यत्वम्). ... कुत्वमिति कुरिति च पर्यायौ ।

[1. 3]

The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by the pratīka अशक्तिजानुकरणार्थः is as follows : अशक्त्या कयाचिद् ब्राह्मण्या ऋतक इति प्रयोक्तव्ये ऌतक इति प्रयुक्तम् । तस्यानुकरणं ब्राह्मण्यॢतक इत्याह, कुमार्यॢतक इत्याह ।

अनुकरण literally means imitation. In a grammatical context it means quotation, reporting; a quoted or reported expression or, more technically, an imitative name. In the context ब्राह्मणी + ऌतक [इत्याह], the final *ī* of *brāhmaṇī* is replaced by *y* (P. 6. 1. 77 : इको यणचि). But to account for this operation here *ḷ* must have the status of *ac*, which depends on its Upadeśa.

(*p.* 12, *l.* 21) अथामुकः कः ... जातिशब्द इत्युच्यते. Bhar. ignores the question as to how and why an *aśaktijānukaraṇa* necessitates ऌकारोपदेश, since it is already done in the *Mbh.*, and dives into the question of the status of an *aśaktijānukaraṇa* word from the point of the fourfold division of a word. It must, however, be said that although अथामुकः कः कल्पते is interpreted to mean 'what kind of word can this be' on the strength of the reply which follows, the wording of the question is not very clear. For अमुकः (which is rather awkward in this context) AL read ऌतकः. But the MS clearly reads अथामुकः.

(*p.* 12, *l.* 22) अयम् = अनुकरणशब्दः. ऌतकम् = अनुक्रियमाणं ऌतकशब्दम्. संबन्ध ऌतकम् = संबन्धे ऌतकम्. But perhaps originally संबन्ध could be संबद्धं. — (*ll.* 23–25) स च ऌतकशब्दो ... नुकरणमिति. This shows that since an *aśaktijānukaraṇa* cannot be set aside by any other word, you cannot rule it out as corrupt. It has to be accounted for in the grammatical system.

[1. 4]

The *pratīka* प्लुत्याद्यर्थश्च stands for the following *Mbh.* : प्लुत्याद्यर्थश्च ऌकारोपदेशः कर्तव्यः । के पुनः प्लुत्यादयः ? प्लुतिद्विर्वचनस्वरिताः । कॢ३प्तशिख । कॢप्तः । प्रकॢप्तः । प्लुत्यादिषु कार्येषु कॢपेर्लत्वं सिद्धम् । तस्य सिद्धत्वादच्कार्याणि न सिध्यन्ति । तस्माद् ऌकारोपदेशः क्रियते ।

The operations mentioned are :

(1) प्लुतिः (prolation) taught in P. 8. 2. 82 ff. : वाक्यस्य टेः प्लुतः etc. The example given is कॢ३प्तशिख where *ḷ* becomes Pluta by P. 8. 2. 84 : दूराद्धूते च (कॢप्तशिख is the name of a person who is here called out from a distance). Although normally the last vowel (टेः) is to become Pluta, optionally a heavy

vowel (except *ṛ*) in any position at a time can undergo prolation (P. 8. 2. 86: गुरोरनृतोऽनन्त्यस्याप्येकैकस्य प्राचाम्).

(2) द्विर्वचनम् (reduplication). P. 8. 4. 47: अनचि च teaches optional reduplication of a *yar* phoneme (any consonant except *h*) which follows an *ac*, unless a vowel follows. Hence the reduplication of *p* in *kḷppta*.

(3) The स्वरित (circumflex) accent. In *prákḷpta* the prefix *pra* is Udātta by P. 6. 2. 49: गतिरनन्तरः. Naturally the remaining vowels have to be Anudāttā (P. 6. 1. 158: अनुदात्तं पदमेकवर्जम्). Further, the Anudātta *ḷ*, which follows the Udātta syllable *pra*, has to be *svarita* (P. 8. 4. 66: उदात्तादनुदात्तस्य स्वरितः). But neither the original Anudātta nor the substitute *Svarita ḷ* is possible unless it is *ac* first.

Readings: (1) (*p.* 11, *l.* 12) MS पिवृतत्वेन; AL ऽपि विवृतः (for विवृतत्वेन as in Sw). The letter पि of the MS is evidently वि and the *avagraha* an error. — (2) (*p.* 11, *l.* 13) Ed. अल्पोयांश्चैव. — (3) (*p.* 11, *l.* 15) MS अल्पीयानित्यवर्णं°; AL अल्पीयानिति। अवर्णं°; Sw अल्पोयो नित्यवर्णं°. Actually अल्पीयान् has already occurred (*l.* 13) as a *pratīka*. So to take it once more as a *pratīka* is not satisfactory. Also AL's mechanical extraction of अवर्णं° is not acceptable inspite of the MS. The context requires ऋवर्णं°. I think that इत्यवर्णं° is a corruption in the MS for इत्यृवर्णं°. — (4) (*p.* 11, *ll.* 22–23) MS AL Sw अर्थगतं. But it is better to read it as अर्थगते, so as to agree with प्रवृतिनिमित्ते. A प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त is always अर्थगत. The scribe often writes an *anusvāra* instead of the stroke for *e*. Cf. the MS reading निवर्तकं which is read as निवर्तके [to agree with शब्दान्तरे in *p.* 12, *l.* 1]). — (5) (*p.* 12, *l.* 1) MS ऌकारपदा(?)शब्दस्य; AL ऌतकश°; Sw ऌकार एवाश°. There is no doubt that our conjecture (ऌकारवतः शब्दस्य) is correct. Cf. below (*ll.* 24–25) ऌकारवदनुकरणम्. — (6) (*p.* 12, *l.* 2) MSAL तत्रास्ति. I follow Sw who reads the MS as तन्नास्ति which gives the intended sense. तत्रास्ति, on the other hand, gives the opposite sense. — (7) (*p.* 12, *l.* 3) MS सतहि, AL स तर्हि. Again Sw reads correctly (सति हि). — (8) (*p.* 12, *l.* 3) Sometimes it is difficult to make out whether the MS reads ऋ or ऌ. In the present case both AL and Sw read ऋकार एव. However I think that the context requires ऌकार एव. — (9) (*p.* 12, *l.* 5) MS कर्तुरस्मणोत्र; AL °रस्मरणाच्च, Sw °रस्म-(र)णात्. Apart from the fact that the last letter is clearly त्र in the MS, there is no use for cumulative च here. — (10) (*p.* 12, *l.* 6) MS सशग्रामो; Sw संशग्रामो (for स शब्दग्रामो as reconstructed by AL). — (11) (*p.* 12, *l.* 8) MS अपेक्षितनिमित्तावत्वा; Sw अपेक्षितनिमित्तवत्त्वाच् (for अनपे° as reconstructed by AL). — (12) (*p.* 12, *l.* 9) MS यदृच्छासंशब्द; Sw °च्छा स शब्दः. The text as in AL. — (13) (*p.* 12, *l.* 9) MS Sw अन्यान्यता पो(Sw पौ°)रुषेयां प्रवृत्तिः; AL अन्याऽन्या पौरुषेयी प्रवृत्तिः. It is possible that the original reading was प्रवृत्तेः, the sentence thus meaning: 'Oh! The infinite variety of human (i. e. individual) behaviour!' But if

we read अस्त्यत्रान्या it will mean 'there *is* here another human willful behaviour', i. e. of a different kind. — (14) (*p.* 12, *l.* 10) MS इत्वेव; AL इत्येष; Sw इत्येव (for इति । एष). — (15) (*p.* 12, *l.* 11) Although the MS reads तदापि which is retained in both the older editions, अपि has no meaning. Hence my suggestion of असौ. — (16) (*p.* 12, *l.* 13) The MS does not read द्रव्ये before गुणनिमित्ता°. But it is required. Cf. यदा तु द्रव्ये निमित्तापेक्षया वर्तते above (*l.* 11). Further, after गुणाभिधायित्वात् गुणशब्दः, the MS reads : एवं द्रव्ये निमित्तापेक्षया गुणशब्दः which seems to be erroneous and so rightly dropped in the older editions. — (17) (*p.* 12, *l.* 17) MS ताछब्दां; AL तान् शब्दान् and also – in bracket – ताच्छब्द्यं वा. — (18) (*p.* 12, *l.* 23) MS सच; ALSw एवं (for स च). The एवं of the older editions is misleading. The sentence actually describes one more (*ca*) characteristic of the *anukaraṇa*. — (19) (*p.* 12, *ll.* 24–25) Sw ऋकारस्येद(म)नुकरणम्. But this is not correct. AL rightly read the MS as ऌकारवदनुकरणम्. For ऌकारवत् cf. ऌकारवत: above (line 1) and the *Readings* 5 above. — (20) (*p.* 12, *l.* 26) MSAL लत्वस्यासिद्धत्वात्. This is incorrect. लत्वस्य सिद्धत्वात् (as in Sw) is the correct reading. Cf. the *Mbh.* quoted above (... प्लुत्यादिषु कार्येषु क्लृपेर्लत्वं सिद्धम्).

[2. 1]

The *Vār.* न्याय्यभावात् कल्पनं संज्ञादिषु refutes the argument based on the *yadṛcchāśabda*-s pleaded for in the previous *Vār.* The *Mbh.* gives too slightly different interpretations of the *Vār.* based upon two different ways in which the expression *kalpanam* is interpreted. The first is : न्याय्यस्य ऋतकशब्दस्य भावात् कल्पनं संज्ञादिषु साधु मन्यते : 'Since the correct word *ṛtaka* is there, only that should be used as a name; the incorrect *ḷtaka* should not be used'. Grammar cannot be called upon to explain incorrect words. The second : न्याय्य ऋतकशब्दः शास्त्रान्वितोऽस्ति । स कल्पयितव्यः साधुः ... : 'Even if the wrong form *ḷtaka* is used as a name, one should regard the correct form *ṛtaka* itself as used while naming'. Kaiy. brings out the difference between the two interpretations thus : पूर्वमुक्तम् ऋतक एव न्याय्यत्वात् प्रयोक्तव्यो न तु ऌतकशब्द इति । इदानीं तु ऋतकशब्दस्यैवायमपभ्रंशोऽशक्तिजत्वाद् ऌतक इत्युच्यते. One does not get a clearcut difference in the *Dīp.* One rather gets the impression that in the first interpretation Bhar. refers to the शिष्टप्रयोग as a reason for the correctness of the form while in the second he refers to the injunctions in the religious texts for the same.

(*p.* 13, *l.* 2) कथं पुनरस्य न्याय्यत्वम्? शिष्टप्रयोगात्। Kaiy. however : ऋतकशब्दो न्याय्यः, कृदन्तं नाम कुर्यादिति स्मृतावुक्तत्वात् । ऋतिः सौत्रो धातुः, तत औणादिकः 'क्वुन् शिल्पिसंज्ञयोरपूर्वस्यापि' इति क्वुन्-प्रत्ययः । — (*p.* 13, *l.* 4) ... जात्यादिषु न स्वयमुत्पाद्यन्ते शब्दाः, एवं यदृच्छाशब्देष्वपि. Along with the continuation of the traditional stock of words, absence of new coinage is equally common to the *yadṛcchā*-words. The rather extreme, and hence funny, examples of काकवासित and हंसवासित are just

meant to indicate the limitations of the naming person in naming. — (*p.* 13, *l.* 6) संज्ञादिष्विति. Bhar. gives two interpretations of this expression. (1) आदि stands for such words, jargon etc., belonging to non-Aryan (*mleccha*) people, words which are restricted to certain non-Aryan assemblies (गोष्ठीविषया: म्लेच्छा:). It is not clear what specific kind of words are intended by Bhar. Kaiy. does not give this interpretation. (2) आदि stands for the other three well known classes of words : names based on जाति, गुण and क्रिया. Kaiy. gives this interpretation alone. Read : संज्ञादिष्विति । आदिशब्देनैतद् दर्शयति – जातिगुणक्रियानिमित्ता अपि शास्त्रान्विता एव प्रयोक्तव्या इति ।

(*p.* 13, *l.* 8) अथ वा संज्ञादिष्विति ... विनिवेशं कुर्वन्ति. Here, in order to extract the meaning of जातिगुणक्रियानिमित्ता: संज्ञा: from the word आदि, Bhar. dissolves the compound in a peculiar way, viz. as Tatpuruṣa (संज्ञानामादिभूतेषु), as against the Bahuvrīhi implied in the previous interpretation. Here Bhar. seems to hold that names of the *yadṛcchā* type are historically older, those based on *jāti* etc. being comparatively younger. His argument (न ह्यनपेक्षितनिमित्तान्तरा अर्थेषु विनिवेशं कुर्वन्ति) is not clear. This view, rather unusual, is completely ignored by Kaiy.

(*p.* 13, *l.* 11) सनिबन्धनापि स्मृति:. This evidently refers to such texts as दशम्युत्तरकालं पुत्रस्य जातस्य नाम विदध्याद् ... द्व्यक्षरं चतुरक्षरं वा नाम कृतं कुर्यात्, न तद्धितम् (quoted in the *Mbh.* Paspaśā). In the following *Dīp.* Bhar. gives two characteristics of a correct word : (1) currency and (2) being capable of grammatical analysis (प्रसिद्धि: शास्त्रं च). Mere existence of a word - of a substandard word not current among the Śiṣṭas — does not qualify it for recognition by grammar. *Ḷtaka* is like that. The grammar cannot read *ḷ* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya for the sake of such an obscure word. — (*p.* 13, *ll.* 15–16) अव्यक्तानुकरणं व्यक्तेनानुकुर्वन्ति शिष्टा:. The sounds made by things when they fall, or snap or are torn off etc. are अव्यक्त 'indistinct', while their reproduction consists of definitely व्यक्त 'distinct' sounds, i. e. speech phonemes. When even an अव्यक्तानुकरण has to consist of recognized speech sounds, what to say of a यदृच्छाशब्द?

(*p.* 13, *l.* 17) अयं तर्हि यदृच्छाशब्दोऽपरिहार्य: ... ऌफिड: ऌफिड्डश्चेति. The proponent of ऌकारोपदेश says : All right. Let us keep away the example of ऌतक since, as you have pointed out, there is a word ऋतक formed from *ṛ* or *ṛtīya* (with the Uṇādi suffix *kvun*) which conveys the same meaning and also is grammatically correct. But there are no such words by the side of ऌफिड and ऌफिड्ड. They have got to be accepted as they are. How will you explain them in the absence of ऌकारोपदेश? Cf. Kaiy. : ऋतकशब्दोऽन्वाख्यातत्वाद् भवतु वा ऌतकशब्दस्य[1] निवर्तक: । ऋफिड ऋफिड्ड इत्येतौ त्वनन्वाख्याताविति कथं ऌफिड ऌफिड्ड इत्येतयोर्निवर्तकौ

1. अनन्वाख्यातस्येत्यादि: (नागेश).

स्यातामिति भावः। — (*p*. 13, *l*. 20) अस्येदमुत्तरम्। एषोऽपि हि ऋफिडः ऋफिड्ड इति. In the MS the words अस्येदमुत्तरम् are actually read after अयं तर्हि यदृच्छाशब्दोऽपरिहार्य इति. I have shifted them before ऋफिडः ऋफिड्ड इति as being appropriate there. The reply runs more or less on the same lines as in the case of ऌतक. The expression अर्तिप्रवृत्तिः is explained in two different ways : (1) A root ऋ alone is read in the Dhātupāṭha. (No such root as ḷ is read there.) We can also assume फिड and फिड्ड as suffixes on the basis of the statement 'प्रत्ययतः प्रकृतेश्च तदूह्यम्'. So by the side of the controversial ऌफिड and ऌफिड्ड there are grammatically correct synonyms ऋफिड and ऋफिड्ड and so they are ruled out by them. ऌफिड and ऌफिड्ड are in no way better than ऌतक. (2) ऋफिड and ऋफिड्ड are genuine and older words. Somehow, in spoken language, they become corrupted (अर्तेश्चैव विकृतापभ्रष्टा प्रवृत्तिर्लभ्यते) into ऌफिड and ऌफिड्ड respectively. The rest of the argument is common.

Kaiy. explains अर्तिप्रवृत्तिः as अर्तेः प्रकृतित्वेन प्रवृत्तिः, on which Nāg. remarks : तथा च फिडफिड्डयोः स एव प्रकृतिः, न तु ऌ इति धात्वन्तरं कल्पनीयम्।

प्रत्ययतः प्रकृतेश्च तदूह्यम् is the last quarter of the Śloka-Vārttika on P. 3. 3. 1. The whole text is :

नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते व्याकरणे शकटस्य च तोकम्।
यन्न विशेषपदार्थसमुत्थं प्रत्ययतः प्रकृतेश्च तदूह्यम्॥

The meaning of प्रत्ययतः etc. is clarified in the Śloka which immediately follows thus :

संज्ञासु धातुरूपाणि प्रत्ययाश्च तथा परे।
कार्याद् विद्यादनूबन्धमेतच्छास्त्रमुणादिषु॥

Commenting on this Kaiy. illustrates a reconstructed base by प्रसिद्धाम् अर्त्यादिकाम् and such a suffix by फिडादिकः — (*p*. 13, *l*. 23) लोके चञ्चलो गन्धर्वे ऌफिड्ड इत्युच्यते. The exact reference is not known. Bhar. is here suggesting that the word ऌफिड्ड, which literally means 'wandering; a wanderer' is a corruption of ऋफिड्ड, derived from √ऋ meaning 'to go, to wander'.

(*p*. 13, *l*. 25) न शिष्टा ऋतकमेव ... भक्ष्यता इति. The passage is not clear. Firstly, some of the readings are not certain, e. g. किं तर्हि vs. एवं तर्हि; ऋतकम् vs. ऌतकम्; हंसतद्गक्षणादि vs. हंसतल्लक्षणादि etc. Secondly, this uncertainty of readings makes it uncertain which view Bhar. is pleading for in this part of the *Dīp*. — whether the acceptability of the word ऌतक or its non-acceptability. I have tentatively taken the passage as pleading for the acceptability of ऌतक and translated accordingly. Thirdly, there is no *Dīp*. at all on the *Mbh*. त्रयी च शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः ... पक्षान्तरैरपि परिहारा भवन्ति (I. 20. 12–13). It is not improbable that some portion of the *Dīp*. is lost.

Readings : (1) (*p*. 13, *l*. 5) AL काकवाशितं हंसवाशितं — (2) (*p*. 13, *l*. 6) Sw reads the MS as तथापि (अ)यं (for तथाविधं) and adds (शक्यः) after कर्तुं. MS Sw शिष्टेनाचरितत्वात्, AL °न अनाचरितत्वात्. — (3) (*p*. 13, *l*. 6) MS शब्दादिषु (for संज्ञादिषु, a reconstruction accepted by all). The MS reads दिच्चित्यादि ... न स्वयं ब्दा twice. ... (4) (*p*. 13, *l*. 8) MS स्वयं ब्दानुत्पाद्य, Sw स्वयमुत्पाद्य. — (5) (*p*. 13, *l*. 11) MSAL प्रतिपादयन्ते. — (6) (*p*. 13, *l*. 15) MS भवारूभयं, Sw °नुभयं. — (7) (*p*. 13, *l*. 18) MSSw ह्यन्ते (for ह्यर्तेर्). — (8) (*p*. 13, *l*. 18) AL कनि (for क्वुनि). — (9) (*p*. 13, *l*. 24) MS इत्येवं ह्, Sw °वं हि. — (10) (*p*. 13, *l*. 25) Sw transposes ऋतकम् and ऌतकम्. — (11) (*p*. 13, *l*. 25) MSAL एवं तर्हि. — (12) (*p*. 13, *ll*. 25–26) MS ऌफिड्डशंपभूत-, AL °ड्डुं अप(शब्द)भूतं, Sw °ड्ड इत्येवंभूत- (for °ड्ड[सद]शं [अ]पभ्रंश-). I think our reconstruction accounts for the MS best. Sw inserts (न) before कर्तव्यम्. — (13) (*p*. 13, *l*. 27) MS °तल्लक्षणादिवत्. — (14) (*p*. 13, *l*. 27) MS दृश्यतेस्सत्युरोधावेषा कृतास्मरण धक्ष्यताति which is evidently corrupt. Sw reads दृश्यते स्त्यत्युरो°. I have here mostly followed AL, though I am not at all sure of its real meaning. — (15) (*p*. 13, *l*. 28) what looks like अपभूतं in the MS is here correctly read as अपभ्रंशं by Sw (cf. 12 above). AL अप(शब्द)भूतं.

[2. 2]

The full text of this *Vār*., which refutes the अशक्तिजानुकरण purpose, is : अनुकरणं शिष्टाशिष्टाप्रतिषिद्धेषु यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु. The purport of the *Vār*. is this : The object of an *anukaraṇa* should be either *śiṣṭa* or *aśiṣṭāpratiṣiddha*. In the present case the original utterance of *ḷ* for *ṛ* is definitely incorrect and hence *pratiṣiddha*. Consequently there is no necessity of reading *ḷ* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya to account for *ḷ* in the reproduction of an incorrect expression. Kaiy. states the point briefly thus : अनुकार्यस्य दुष्टत्वादनुकरणमपि दुष्टं मन्यते सुरापानादिवत्. On this Nāg. further comments thus : एवं चासाध्वनुकरणस्यासाधुत्वाच्छास्त्राविषयत्वात् तदर्थता ऌकारस्य न युज्यत इति भावः ।

(*p*. 14, *l*. 3) यो ह्न वानुक्रियते यो नु is obscure.

(*p*. 14, *l*. 4) MS reads यद्यप्यर्थो वैदिकस् ... वेदे च पठ्यते twice. The sentence यद्यप्यर्थो ... लोक इत्युच्यते tries to justify the word लोके in the *Mbh*. passage : लोके तावत् — य एवमसौ ददाति, य एवमसौ यजते, य एवमसावधीत इति तस्यानुकुर्वन् दद्याच्च यजेत चाधीयीत च, सोऽप्यभ्युदयेन युज्यते. How can *dāna* and *yāga* be called *laukika*, since they are enjoined in the Śāstra ? Bhar's reply is : True, the matter *is* Vedic, still the words which convey it are *laukika*. That is why *dadāti*, *yajate* etc. are given in the category of *loke*. Kaiy. explains : दानादीनां स्मार्तत्वाल्लौकिकत्वमुच्यते. Similarly Nāg. : यागोऽत्र स्मार्तो ग्राह्यः.

(*p*. 14, *l*. 6) विषम उपन्यासः. — The full text of the *Mbh*. represented by this and the following *pratīka*-s is : विषम उपन्यासः । यश्चैवं हन्ति, यश्चानुहन्ति, उभौ तौ

हतः। यश्चापि पिबति, यश्चानुपिबति, उभौ तौ पिबतः। यस्तु खल्वेवमसौ ब्राह्मणं हन्ति, एवमसौ सुरां वा पिबतीति तस्यानुकुर्वन् स्नातानुलिप्तो माल्यगुणकण्ठः कदलीस्तम्भं छिन्द्यात् पयो वा पिबेत्, न स मन्ये पतितः स्यात्।

As against त्यागादनुष्ठानाद् वा of Bhar., Kaiy. says : विहितकरणाद् धर्मोत्पत्तिः प्रतिषिद्धाचरणाच्चाधर्मोत्पत्तिः. — (*p.* 14, *l.* 7) शक्यं चैतत् वक्तुम् ... अनुकरणं भवति. Mere imitation of some external act, where the original content is not there, is no imitation at all. The sentence यत्र ह्यनुकृतिमात्रं is not very clear. I have tentatively supplied a **न**, but I am not very sure about it.

(*p.* 14, *ll.* 9–10) Kaiy. almost copies the *Dīp.* when he gives the significance of the two adjectives. Read : स्नातानुलिप्त इति स्वस्थचित्तत्वं दर्शयति। अस्वस्थेन हि चित्तेनाकार्यं क्रियते। माल्यगुणकण्ठ इति। लोकमध्ये प्रकाशत इत्यर्थः। अकार्यं ह्यप्रकाशं क्रियते। — (*p.* 14, *l.* 12) परं च ... दोषो भवति. Even if it is granted, for the time being, that some external minor similarity constitutes *anukaraṇa*, still ... — (*p.* 14, *l.* 13) अर्थपदार्थक means a word used to convey meaning while शब्दपदार्थक means a word used to convey itself, i. e. its form. In ordinary life a word has usually the former function, while in grammar usually the latter.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 16) अपशब्द इत्यपि तस्यापशब्दः स्यात्। अस्य हि etc. This shows the absurdity which will result if the opponent's view, that the reproduction of an incorrect word is also sinful, is accepted. — (*p.* 14, *l.* 18) स्यादेतत् — अपशब्द ... प्रातिपदिकमिति. A cryptic sentence. As the expression स्यादेतत् suggests, the first part contains an objection. The imitative name *ḷtaka* has no grammatical explanation (reading अनन्वाख्यातत्वात्) and as such it must be regarded as an incorrect word (thus requiring no grammatical provision). The reply is that the imitation *ḷtaka* satisfies the conditions laid down in P. 1. 2. 45 : *arthavat* ... etc. and as such must be regarded as a legitimate *prātipadika*. So the reading of *ḷ* is necessary.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 20) अयं खल्वपि भूयः. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : अयं खल्वपि भूयोऽनुकरणशब्दोऽपरिहार्यः, यदर्थं उपदेशः कर्तव्यः — साध्ऌकारमधीते, मध्ऌकारमधीत इति। The *Dīp.* points out the merit of this new example by saying that it is not a reproduction of an incorrect word (एतदप्यत्र नास्त्येवासाधोरयमनुकरण इति) unlike the previous case of *ḷtaka*. Since साध्ऌकारमधीते e. g. is a correct expression, the *yaṇ* Saṁdhi *v* requires a grammatical explanation. This can be given only if *ḷ* is accepted as an *ac*, which in turn necessitates its inclusion in the Akṣarasamāmnāya. — (*p.* 14, *l.* 21) यदि कॢपिस्थस्येति. The *Mbh.* text is : यदि कॢपिस्थस्य, कॢपेश्च लत्वमसिद्धम्। तस्यासिद्धत्वाद् ऋकार एवाच्कार्याणि भविष्यन्ति। When the *Dīp.* says : आदावेवात्र प्रतिविहितमिति, it is referring to this *asiddha* nature of *ḷ* in *kḷp* (mentioned at the outset in the *Mbh.*) which will make *ṛ* subject to operations, these being subsequently transferable to *ḷ*. —

(*p.* 14, *l.* 23) The *Mbh.* भवेत् तदर्थेन नार्थः स्यात् is beautifully explainecd by Nāg. thus : तदर्थेन क्लृपिस्थऌकारार्थेन ऌकारस्योपदेशेन प्रयोजनं न भवति, एवं यद्यपि भवेत्, तथापि तदनुकरणार्थेनार्थ इत्यर्थः। Incidentally, Bhar. formulates a principle which was implicit in the *Mbh.*: The asiddha character belongs to the grammatical process (*prakriyā*), not to the actual usage. (Kaiy. follows : Read प्रयोगस्थस्येदमनुकरणम्, प्रयोगे च नास्ति 'पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्' इति भावः। Nāg.,with his usual sharpness, further paraphrases प्रयोगे by अनुकरणप्रयोगे). — The expression क्लृपिस्थपदार्थक means क्लृपिस्थः ऌकारः पदार्थो=वाच्यो यस्य.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 25) प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवति. The full text of the *Mbh.* runs as follows : इदमवश्यं कर्तव्यम् 'प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवति'। किं प्रयोजनम्? 'द्विः पचन्त्वित्याह' — 'तिङ्ङतिङः' इति निघातो यथा स्यात्। 'अग्नी इत्याह' — ईदूदेद् द्विवचनं प्रगृह्यसंज्ञं भवति इति प्रगृह्यसंज्ञा यथा स्यात्।

Here the necessity of grammatical provision for *ḷ* (an imitative name of *ḷ* in *kḷp*) is tacitly admitted. Still it is maintained that ऌकारोपदेश is not inevitable; the Pari. *prakṛtivad anukaraṇaṁ bhavati* (*Paribhāṣenduśekhara* 36) which says that an imitative name behaves like the original utterance will do equally well. In fact one must prefer this Paribhāṣā to the ऌकारोपदेश since the Paribhāṣā is indispensable for certain grammatical operations (explained later on) in cases like द्विः पचन्त्वित्याह.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 25) सत्यपि वचने क्वचिदियं ... 'परिव्यवेभ्यः क्रियः' इति. Before explaining the examples of this metarule given in the *Mbh.* Bhar. observes that it is optional and, like a lawyer, he tries to find rational justification for both the apparent observance and non-observance of the Paribhāṣā. He argues thus : it all depends on how you look at the word which is to be reproduced (*prakṛti*). You can look at it either as a mere sequence of sounds, ignoring its meaning. Or, you can look at it as characterized by a particular meaning. Now, the usual categories of a word (like *dhātu*, *upasarga* etc.) are based on a particular kind of meaning. So a particular sound sequence like, say, *krī* will behave as a *dhātu* (and consequently will have the *iyaṅ* substitute) only if the meaning (viz. *dravyavinimaya*) is kept in view. So you have *kriyaḥ* in *parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ* (P. 1. 3. 18). On the other hand, if the *prakṛti* is looked upon as a mere sound sequence, then it cannot be called *dhātu* etc., and so no *iyaṅ* will be there as in *jeḥ* in *viparābhyāṁ jeḥ* (P. 1. 3. 19). If the status of a *dhātu* etc. is there in the *anukārya* (because of the consideration of meaning), that will pass on to the *anukaraṇa*; if it is not there in the *anukārya* (because of the prominence given to the form, to the exclusion of meaning), naturally there is no question of that status passing on to the *anukaraṇa*. (But then why does Bhar. say : क्वचिदियं परिभाषा न प्रवर्तते ?)

Cf. the following extract from the *Padamañjarī* (on P. 1. 3. 19) with what Bhar. says : अथ कथं जेरिति निर्देशः ? यावता प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवतीति 'अचि श्नुधातु' इत्यनेनेयङादेशेन भवितव्यम् । न च दीर्घेषु सावकाशमियङं परत्वात् 'घेर्ङिति' इति गुणो बाधत इति युक्तम्, ह्रस्वेष्वपि पूर्वविप्रतिषेधेनेयङ इष्टत्वात् । तथा च 'क्षियः' इति निर्देशः । उच्यते । धातुत्वं तावदर्थाश्रयम्, क्रियावचनो धातुरिति । इह [1]चाविवक्षितार्थं रूपमात्रमनुकृतमित्यनुकार्यस्यापि धातुत्वं नास्ति, प्रागेवानुकरणस्य ।

Looking at this problem independently it just seems that there was simply no uniform practice in this respect. Pāṇini himself uses *jeḥ* and *kriyaḥ* promiscuously in two consecutive rules. The attempt of the later grammarians to justify both is just an intellectual exercise.

(*p*. 15, *l*. 2) द्विः पचन्तु ... भिधायित्वाद्धि तिङः. Somebody says : पचन्तु पचन्तु 'let them cook, let them cook'. Someone else quotes him thus : द्विः पचन्त्वित्याह 'he twice said : "Let them cook"'. Now in the original utterance (*anukārya*) the verb is unaccented, the loss of the acute accent being accounted for by *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ* (P. 8. 1. 28). The same unaccented form is also desired in the quotation (*anukaraṇa*). But it is not available because though formally *pacantu* ends in *tiṅ*, semantically and technically it cannot be called a *tiṅanta* because a *tiṅanta* is expected to denote either the agent or object or some other participant (साधनाभिधायित्वात्) in the activity, while *pacantu* in the quotation simply does not do any such thing. It just denotes its form. So to ensure the loss of the accent in the quotation, the status of *tiṅanta* is necessary. Hence the indispensability of the Pari. प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवति.

In translating द्विः पचन्त्वित्याह I have construed द्विः with आह (i. e. पचन्तु इति द्विः आह) on the authority of Kaiy. (पचन्तु पचन्त्विति केनचिदुक्ते द्विः पचन्त्वित्यनुकरणम्) and Nāg. (पचन्तु इति द्विराहेत्यन्वयः). But I do not see why द्विः पचन्तु 'let them cook twice' could not be the original sentence. Its quotation will be the same (द्विः पचन्त्वित्याह), though the meaning now will be different : 'he said : "Let them cook twice"'. But inspite of this difference of meaning the sentence can still remain an equally good example, why the Pari. concerned has to be accepted. Anyway as far as Bhar. is concerned, he is silent on this point.

(*p*. 15, *l*. 3) 'अग्नी' इत्ययमाह etc. The *Dīp*. reconstructs the original sentence as अग्नी ज्वालितौ 'two fires were enkindled'. In the original utterance the dual number is all right, because two fires are denoted. But in the reporting (अग्नी इत्याह) the dual is difficult to explain, because the word denotes a single entity, viz. its own form, and not the two fires. So प्रकृतिवत् ... etc. is necessary.

Incidentally, the *Dīp*. तत्र द्व्योरर्थयोर्वा एकाभिव्यञ्जकस्य वा द्विवचनं नान्यस्येति is defective. Firstly, in view of the word एकाभिव्यञ्जकस्य, the words एकवचनं वा are

1. वाविवक्षितार्थं in the Varanasi Ed., (1965), is evidently a misprint.

expected after द्विवचनम्. Hence their addition in the bracket. Secondly, the construction द्वयोरर्थयोर्वा एकाभिव्यञ्जकस्य वा is not quite regular. One rather expected एकस्याभिव्यञ्जकस्य वा for otherwise the desired connection between द्वयोरर्थयोः and अभिव्यञ्जकस्य will not be there. (After अभिव्यञ्जकस्य, scil. प्रातिपदिकस्य.)

(*p*. 15, *l*. 6) अत्र त्विदमस्ति वक्तव्यम् ... अनेन ईत्संज्ञा भविष्यति. This *Dīp*., the last part of which is not quite clear, raises a point which was ignored in the *Mbh*. The solution *prakṛtivad anukaraṇaṁ bhavati* is all right in the case of *ḷ* when it refers to *ḷ* in *kḷp*. For, the *anukārya*, i. e. *ḷ* in *kḷp* being *asiddha*, it is *ṛ*, which has an *ac* status, that undergoes the desired operations which are eventually transfered to *ḷ*. Since the *prakṛti* or the *anukārya* is thus eligible for *ac* status (and consequently the desired vocalic operations), its *anukaraṇa*, viz. *ḷ* in *sādhv ḷkāram adhīte* also gets the status of *ac*. So far so good. But what about the *ḷ* which is used as a code-letter in roots like *gam-ḷ sṛp-ḷ* etc. ? In the absence of ऌकारोपदेश this code-letter, the *prakṛti*, itself cannot have an *ac* status, much less its *anukaraṇa*. Bhar. here anticipates a solution also. It could be said that *ḷ* in *gam-ḷ* etc. is the same as *ḷ* in *kḷp*, and since the latter has an *ac* status the *ḷ* in *gam-ḷ* etc. also could have it. But then this would equally apply to *ḷ* in *ḷtaka* also, adds the *Dīp*. Kaiy. also has raised this problem. He thinks that Pāṇini's rule पुषादिद्युताद्य्ऌदितः परस्मैपदेषु (P. 3. 1. 55) wherein *yaṇ* Saṁdhi is observed before *ḷ* is a sufficient indication that the original *ḷ* in *gam-ḷ* etc. and also its *anukaraṇa* behave as *ac*. Read : ननु गम्ऌ सृप्ऌ इत्यादिस्थस्य यदानुकरणं तदा कथं प्रकृतिवद्भावः ? द्युताद्य्ऌदित इति ऌकारे परतो यणादेशकरणादित्संज्ञानुवादाच्च धात्वनुबन्धस्य ऌकारस्याच्कार्याण्यनुमीयन्ते । ततस्तदनुकरणस्य सिद्धः प्रकृतिवद्भावः ।

(*p*. 15, *l*. 11) यदि प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं ... इत्याह इति. An objection against the application of the maxim प्रकृतिवदनुकरणम् to *ḷ* in ब्राह्मण्य्ऌतक इत्याह. The objector points out that this maxim is a two-edged weapon. If it can extend the *ac* status of *ḷ* in *kḷp* to *ḷ* in साध्व्ऌकारमधीते, it can also equally extend the incorrectness of *ḷ* in the Brāhmaṇa lady's pronunciation of *ṛ* (in *ṛtaka*) to the reproduced *ḷ* in ब्राह्मण्य्ऌतक इत्याह. And since an incorrect word deserves no provision in grammar, the अशक्तिजानुकरण argument in favour of ऌकारोपदेश cannot be accepted.

(*p*. 15, *l*. 13) ततः प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं ... ऽशक्तिजानुकरणार्थं ऌकारोपदेशः. This *Dīp*. shows how the dictum प्रकृतिवदनुकरणम् is to be properly interpreted and how, then, the *anukaraṇa* in the present case is not affected by the incorrectness of the original. The upshot of the whole discussion is that the Vārttikakāra's view, viz. that ऌकारोपदेश is necessary for अशक्तिजानुकरण, stands : एवमवस्थितोऽशक्तिजानुकरणार्थं ऌकारोपदेशः. Two arguments are mainly advanced in this respect : (1) The *prakṛti* mentioned in the maxim has to be authoritative (प्रामाणिक), i. e. a word which is either mentioned in, or can be explained by, the rules of grammar. And no grammar ever mentions an incorrect *ḷ*, for the simple reason

that grammar explains only correct words (साधूनामन्वाख्यानात्). (2) It is only a grammatical operation that can be extended on the basis of the dictum प्रकृतिवद् etc. And incorrectness is certainly no grammatical operation (शास्त्रपूर्वकं कार्यम्).

Since ततः प्रकृति- begins the refutation of the above argument, ततः is rather strange here. Could it be अतः ? The idiom of Śāstric Sanskrit here requires एवं तर्हि or some such word.

स्थानिवदादेशोऽनल्विधौ (P. 1. 1. 56) is a rule which also extends the status of the original (*sthānin*) to the substitute. This rule is quoted as a parallel. Here also not any and every *sthānin* is to be understood, but only that which is taught in grammar. — Between यः and स्थानी, a word प्रामाणिकः is understood. — अथानुमानात् etc. What *anumāna* is exactly meant, is not clear. The absence of grammatical explanation is the proof of the incorrectness of a word. Perhaps it is suggested that this itself could be regarded as the positive proof of the grammar teaching this *prakṛti* in its incorrect form. सामर्थ्यगृहीता, understood indirectly. — तद्विषयस्य धर्मस्य = अपशब्दत्वस्य.

(*p.* 15, *l.* 24) अपरे प्रत्याख्यात एव ... वाक्यशेषः. This *Dīp.* records a different view about the interpretation of the *Mbh.* here. According to the interpretation given so far by the *Dīp.* the conclusion of the *Mbh.* is : एवमवस्थितो ऽशक्तिजानुकरणार्थं लृकारोपदेशः. In the passage which follows Bhar. says that the *Mbh.* न चापशब्दः प्रकृतिः। न ह्यपशब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते। न चानुपदिष्टा प्रकृतिरस्ति is understood by some commentators as refuting the अशक्तिजानुकरणार्थः लृकारोपदेशः view i. e. as continuing the argument made in अपशब्द एवासौ भवति। ... अपशब्दो ह्यस्य प्रकृतिः। The *Dīp.* explains how the refutation is to be understood from the *Mbh.* but, here also, some part of the *Dīp.* is not quite clear.

According to this interpretation, says the *Dīp.*, the words प्रयोजनं भवितुमर्हति are to by supplied in the *Mbh.* after न चापशब्दः. This apparently means that an incorrect word does not constitute a sufficient reason, evidently, for grammatical provision. But the difficulty with this explanation is that the *Mbh.* here contains the word प्रकृतिः after न चापशब्दः. Now nobody quarrels with the view that an incorrect expression does not require grammatical provision. The point that has been made all along in the *Mbh.* is that the quotation (*anukaraṇa*) of such an incorrect expression is *not* itself incorrect; it does therefore require grammatical provision. लृकारोपदेश is necessary for such cases as ब्राह्मण्लृतक इत्याह. How is this point met in this different interpretation ?

Further, तस्मात् (after इतर आह) seems to be a wrong writing for यस्मात् since, in this interpretation, the *Mbh.* न ह्यपशब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते is supposed to support the ellipsis प्रयोजनं भवितुमर्हति. But even if one made this emendation, the reasoning is not clear. Lastly, the *pratīka* न चानुपदिष्टा प्रकृतिरस्ति is followed

by the *Dīp.* : यणाद्गनामिति वाक्यशेषः. As this is unintelligible AL emend यणाद्गनाम् into यणादीनाम्. Apparently यण् here refers to *y* in ब्राह्मण्यऌतक इत्याह and *v* in साध्वॢकारमधीते. But there is no question about the *prakṛti* of this *y* (*ī* in *brāhmaṇī*) and of *v* (*u* in *sādhu*). These *prakṛti*-s are *upadiṣṭa* all right. The real question is about the *ac* status of the following *ḷ* which is necessary for the *yaṇ* substitution. This difficulty remains even with the emendation of AL. Altogether, although the main thrust of this interpretation is not difficult to see, the whole argument remains obscure.

Perhaps that is why Kaiy. altogether ignores this interpretation and gives the usually accepted interpretation (first given in the *Dīp.*). Read : न चापशब्द इति। सिद्धान्तवादी। प्रकरणाद्धि शास्त्रीया प्रकृतिराश्रीयते, शास्त्रनिबन्धनं च कार्यमतिदिश्यते। अपशब्दश्च न शास्त्रीया प्रकृतिः, अनुपदिष्टत्वात्। न चापशब्दत्वं शास्त्रीयं कार्यं, नापि तदतिदेष्टुं शक्यम्। ... तदेवं भाष्यकारेणाशक्तिजानुकरणार्थत्वम् ऌकारोपदेशस्य स्थापितम्।

The last point to be mentioned in this connection is this : Bhar. has quoted the *Mbh.* passages when he gives this different interpretation but, curiously, not when he gives first his own interpretation. Thus when he says : प्रामाणिका या प्रकृतिरुपदिश्यते, सा प्रकृतित्वेनाश्रीयते (*l.* 14), he is evidently commenting on न चापशब्दः प्रकृतिः. Similarly he has evidently in mind the *Mbh.* न ह्यपशब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते when he says : न च व्याकरणे अपशब्द इत्येव कश्चित् ऌ प्रकृतौ उपदिश्यते (*l.* 16). Lastly, his words न च सामर्थ्यगृहीता प्रकृतिर्भवितुमर्हति (*l.* 17) apparently refer to the *Mbh.* न चानुपदिष्टा प्रकृतिरस्ति. Why he follows this unusual procedure, I cannot say.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 14, *l.* 2) MS त्रियतौ is very probably to be read as क्रियते with a *daṇḍa* (followed in AL). This also seems to be supported by the following शिष्टैर्यत्तु (with a Saṁdhi between शिष्टैः and यत्तु). But this makes शिष्टैः the agent of प्रतिषिद्धम् while I think that it is rather the agent of अनुक्रियते. So I follow Sw in reading अनुक्रियते शिष्टैः। यत्तु etc. The agent of प्रतिषिद्धम् is of course something like वेदेन or शास्त्रेण understood. — (2) (*p.* 14, *l.* 2) Sw's text : यत्तु न प्रतिषिद्धं तदन्येन कृतमित्यनुक्रियते entirely misses the real significance. — (3) (*p.* 14, *l.* 4) The MS reads यद्यप्यर्थौ...वेदे पठ्यते twice. — (4) (*p.* 14, *l.* 4) Sw unnecessarily reads the MS विदिकः (our वैदिकः) as ऽपि (लौ)किकः. — (5) (*p.* 14, *l.* 4) The *Mbh.* reads विश्वसृजः (quoted as °जितः in the *Dīp.*).—(6) (*p.* 14, *l.* 8) MS सादृशा, AL सादृश्याद्, Sw सादृश्या (for our सदृशा). न is our addition. — (7) (*p.* 14, *l.* 9) *Mbh.* खल्वेवम् (quoted as खल्विदम् in the *Dīp.*). — (8) (*p.* 14, *l.* 9) Sw reads the MS °छास्त्रनहिचित्ते as °शास्त्रं न हि (किं)चित्. I follow AL's °स्वस्थेन हि चित्ते(ना)° as being more likely to be the original. — (9) (*p.* 14, *l.* 10) Sw reads the MS प्राकाम्योप° as प्रकाशोप°. AL's प्राकाश्योप° is of course better. — (10) (*p.* 14, *l.* 10) Sw reads the MS सुराति। रह as सुरां हि इह (for सुरां हि as in AL). — (11) (*p.* 14, *l.* 11) AL read the MS यद्यपि as पयसि (!) — (12) (*p.* 14, *l.* 11)

MSSw °लाव, AL °लाभ (for °भाव). — (13) (*p*. 14, *l*. 12) MSSw नृद° (for कदली°). — (14) (*p*. 14, *l*. 12) AL सदृशमनुकरणत्वं न (for °शामनुकरणत्वेन). I add a न (prob. dropped hapl.) as required by the context. — (15) (*p*. 14, *l*. 13) Sw reads the MS क्रुवंति as ब्रुवन्ति. — (16) (*p*. 14, *l*. 14) MS प्रयुंजात, AL प्रयुञ्जानः, Sw प्रयुञ्जते. — (17) (*p*. 14, *l*. 16) *Mbh*. इत्येव (quoted as इत्यपि in the *Dīp*.). — (18) (*p*. 14, *l*. 17) MSSw स त एवास्याः, AL सन्तु एवास्य (for सर्वे एव वाच्याः. With this emendation, cf. Kaiy.: अस्य हि गाव्यादयोऽपभ्रंशा वाच्याः). — (19) (*p*. 14, *l*. 17) MS °भोदाना, Sw °भेदेन (for °भेदान्). — (20) (*p*. 14, *l*. 18) I emend MS अन्वाख्यातत्वात् to अनन्वा° as required by the consideration of meaning. I follow the punctuation of AL as being natural and meaningful. Sw follows a different punctuation which I fail to understand. — (21) (*p*. 14, *l*. 20) Sw rightly emends the MS नास्त्येवसा° to नास्त्येवासा° since असाधोः is intended. Cf. Kaiy.: असाधोरनुकरणमित्येदप्यत्र नास्तीति भावः. — (22) (*p*. 14, *l*. 22) MS योयन्न is properly read as सोऽयं न in the earlier eds. — (23) (*p*. 14, *l*. 26) I read the MS तदाधातु° as equal to तदाऽधातु, and so I naturally retain नष्ट (after असौ धर्मो) of the MS. The eds., on the other hand, read तदा धातु° and so they have to read दृष्ट against the MS, which is not at all warranted. Besides the whole intended contrast between this ऽधातुरूपेण and the subsequent धात्वनुकरण (*p*. 15, *l*. 7) is lost. — (24) (*p*. 14, *l*. 28) MS भवनक्रुतो(तौ) is unintelligible. AL emend it to भवेन्न कृतः, Sw to (न) भवति (प्र)कृतः. I have dropped क्रुतो(तौ), rather reluctantly. — (25) (*p*. 15, *l*. 6) After मुच्लृ, the MS reads a letter which looks like ष, which AL reconstruct as षद्लृ. — (26) (*p*. 15, *l*. 7) For considerations of grammar and meaning, I read क्रुपिश्रायं as क्रुपिस्थश्रायं. Cf. क्रुपिस्थ which follows in the same sentence. — (27) (*p*. 15, *l*. 8) I follow Sw's emendation of the MS ऋतकेति into °केऽपि. — (28) (*p*. 15, *ll*. 8-9) MS ब्रुवतेतदुक्तं, AL °ते। तदुक्तं, Sw °तैतदुक्तं (this emendation is intelligent and worth considering). — (29) (*p*. 15, *l*. 9) MS Sw °करनुकारोवासंवक्तव्य इति ष्टदिति लृति वाचनं (Sw लृति(लृ) वाव(च)नं), AL °क र्लृ कारो वा स वक्तव्य इति। ऋति ॠ वावचनम्। लृति ॡ वावचनम्।). — (30) (*p*. 15, *l*. 10) MS अनेनपीत्संज्ञा, AL °न हीत्संज्ञो, Sw °न हीत्संज्ञा (for °नापीत्संज्ञा). — (31) (*p*. 15, *l*. 12) AL -पदार्थिको, Sw -पदार्थको. — (32) (*p*. 15, *l*. 13) MS शब्दव्यविहारः. The second member of this compound has been rightly taken to be व्यवहारः in the eds. They, however, retain the first part, शब्द (Sw adding विद् to it) which is doubtful to me. The second letter, as is seen elsewhere also in the MS, is to be read as ष्ट. So I think that श is a scribal error for शि, and that the original text must have been शिष्टव्यवहारः, which suits the context admirably well. — (33) (*p*. 15, *l*. 16) Sw इत्येव. — (34) (*p*. 15, *l*. 16) MSSw ट, probably rightly read as लृ by AL. — (35) (*p*. 15, *l*. 17) MS अथनु°, Sw अप्यनु (for अथानु° as in AL). — (36) (*p*. 15, *l*. 18) The MS clearly reads शास्त्रप्रवर्तकं, but this must be a learned error for शास्त्रपूर्वकं (so actually emended by Sw). — (37) (*p*. 15, *l*. 21) Although the MS clearly reads तत्तद्विव(? °ष)यस्य,

I think simply तद्विषयस्य is intended. — (38) (*p*. 15, *l*. 27) MS Sw यणाद्रनामिति, AL यणादीना°.

[2. 3]

एकदेशविकृतस्य ... etc. This *Vār*. refutes the third purpose, mentioned in the previous *Vār*. in favour of लृकारोपदेश. It was then said that *ḷ* in *kḷp* is *siddha* as far as the three operations, viz. prolation etc., are concerned. So there the medium of *ṛ* (which possesses an *ac* status) is not available. Consequently, it was mentioned, that *ḷ* had to be read in order to explain these operations in connection with *ḷ*. The present *Vār*. now says that it is not necessary. The Pari. (37) एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवत् can come to our help. According to this Pari. what is modified or changed in a part does not lose its identity; it does not become something else. A dog, even after his tail is cut off, does not cease to be a dog. Similarly, what happens in *ṛ*>*ḷ* is that the central consonantal portion *r* (in *ṛ*) is replaced by the consonantal portion *l* (in *ḷ*). The whole (viz. *ṛ*) as such is still recognizable, it is claimed (ऋकारे रेफभागस्य ले कृते स एव ऋकार इति प्रत्यभिज्ञानादिति भाव: as Kaiy. says). So *ṛ* can still undergo the operations like prolation, which can, as usual, be eventually passed on to *ḷ*. लृकारोपदेश is not necessary.

(*p*. 16, *l*. 1) नात्र ग्रहीतव्यम् ... प्रवृत्तिरेवाश्रीयते. Bhar. makes it clear that Kāty. is not here invoking the Pari. स्थानिवदादेशोऽनल्विधौ in order to extend the status of *ṛ* to *ḷ*. That Pari. will not help us here because of the proviso *analvidhau*. The change *ṛ* > *ḷ* is an *alvidhi* ' a phonetic operation ' and so it will prevent the application of that Pari. to the present case. So it is only the practice of the world (लोकप्रवृत्ति:), viz. to continue to regard even a *chinnapuccha śvan* as a *śvan*, that is referred to here. Cf. Nāg. : एवं च छिन्नपुच्छदृष्टान्तेन लोकन्यायसिद्धमस्य ऋत्वमित्यर्थ: .

(*p*. 16, *l*. 3) ननु च लोके ... यथा ह्रस्वदीर्घयोरिति. This discusses an objection against the parallel of the ' dog whose tail is cut '. It is all right in the case of the dog because, even after his tail is cut off, he continues to belong to the same species. The recognition of identity, even after the change, entitles him to the name ' dog '. What sort of continuation (*anuṣaṅga*) of generic nature is there after *ṛ* is replaced by *ḷ*, which would warrant identification (*sampratyaya*) of the two and consequently the treatment of *ḷ* as *ṛ* ? The reply is given that here also there is equally a जात्यनुषङ्ग. The *Dīp*. says that *ṛ* and *ḷ* form one class, just as the short and corresponding long vowels (*i* / *ī*, *u* / *ū*) form one class. As we have seen previously, Kāty. proposes to dispense with the *aṇ*- portion in P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्यय: by resorting to the *ākṛti* view. The reply is given on that alternative.

There are, however, two difficulties in the passage. (1) What is exactly the basis, or the basic common property, which would justify putting *ṛ* and *ḷ* in one class ? (2) What is the verb in the clause ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः ? Something like आश्रीयते ? Or प्रत्याख्यायते itself ? As regards the first question, it is all right for *a* and *ā*, for instance, to be classed together, because both have a common point of articulation, viz. *kaṇṭha*. But there does not seem to be a similar common property between *ṛ* and *ḷ*. Their points of articulation are different. Did Bhar. mean that although the central consonantal portions (*r* and *l* respectively) are different, the remaining portions, i. e. what is called *ajbhakti*, are common and so could form a basis of a class ? I do not know why Kaiy. is silent. Nāg. however, at one place, says that this belonging to one class has to be understood by way of extension. In other words, the declaration in the *Vār*. (ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः) of the homogeneity of *ṛ* and *ḷ* is as good as to extend *samānajātitva* to the two : अत्र पक्षे अणुग्रहणप्रत्याख्यानेऽपि ऋऌवर्णयोः सावर्ण्येन समानजातित्वातिदेशान्न दोषः. It is difficult to say whether this concept of *atideśa* was in the mind of Bhar. also.

As regards the 2nd point, I have understood something like आश्रीयते as the intended verb.

(*p*. 16, *l*. 5) राज्ञः क च ... अल्लोपोऽन इति. This *Mbh*. objects to the Pari. on the ground that its application could lead to undesirable results elsewhere. For example, P. 4. 2. 140 : राज्ञः क च teaches the substitute *k* for the final of *rājan* when the suffix *cha* (= *īya*) follows. After this substitution, argues the objector, the new stem *rājak* will still be regarded as the old *rājan* itself on the strength of this Pari. This will give opportunity to P. 6. 4. 134 : अल्लोपोऽनः to apply, resulting into the wrong form **rājkīyam*. So the Pari. एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवत् cannot be accepted. ऋकारोपदेश is unavoidable. — कस्यचिद्धर्मस्य 'of any property' (here) refers to the common word-form *rāja-*. स एवायमिति ... बुद्धिः, recognition of identity.

(*p*. 16, *l*. 8) षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्येति. This is the addition, proposed by the opponent, to the *Pari*. to avoid the undesirable form **rājkīyam*. The *Pari*. in the emended form (एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवत् षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्य) will apply (and the new form *-ak* will be taken as identical with the old form *-an*) only when the element, for which some operation is taught, is mentioned in the Genitive in the original rule which teaches the modification. Nāg., in his characteristic way, puts the idea in the technical language thus : येन विकारेण (ककाररूपादेशेन) यस्य विकृतस्य (अकः) यद् रूपं (अन्-रूपम्) एकदेशविकृतन्यायेन प्राप्यते, तद्रूपावच्छिन्नस्य (तस्य) तेन रूपेण तद्विकारविधौ षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्य (एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवद्भवति). Now the rule 6. 4. 134 teaches the elision of *a* in *an* while in the original rule (4. 2. 140) which teaches $n > k$ substitution, the Genitive *rājñaḥ* occurs, not *anaḥ*. Since

anaḥ is not present in this latter rule, *-ak* cannot be said to be the same as *-an* and consequently P. 6. 4. 134 : अल्लोपोऽनः will not apply when *rājakīyam* is to be formed. The Pari. in the emended form rules out the wrong form (and consequently makes the ऌकारोपदेश unnecessary). The *Dīp.* यस्य विकारकाले ... न अन्-शब्दः (*ll.* 8–10) makes this point clear. — After राजशब्दः, add एकदेशविकृतो ऽप्यनन्यः to make the sence complete. With अत्र च ककारविधानकाले राज्ञः षष्ठी, नानः, cf. Kaiy. : 'राज्ञः क च' इत्यत्र राजन्-शब्दः षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टः, न तु अन्, इति लोपाभावः.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 10) क्लृप्तशिख इत्यत्र ... नास्त्यनन्यत्वम्. A retort by the protagonist of ऋकारोपदेश. If the addition of षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्य is accepted, how will you account for the Pluta in *kḷptaśikha*? Here in this vocative, *ḷ* is optionally Pluta (P. 8. 2. 86). It could be accounted for by regarding it as *ṛ* by the maxim *ekadeśavikṛtam* .... But you have now added *ṣaṣṭhīnirdiṣṭasya* which makes this difficulty. In the original rule : P. 8. 2. 18 : कृपो रो लः, which lays down the modification *ṛ* > *ḷ*, *ṛ* is not mentioned in the Genitive (it is *r* which is so mentioned). So there is no identity (*ananyatvam*). You are defeating your own purpose (उद्देशविस्मृतिरेव, as the *Chāyā* observes)!

Observation : Actually here the protagonist of ऌकारोपदेश has either forgotten, or he deliberately ignores, the fact that even if there were identity between *ṛ* and *ḷ*, the latter could not become Pluta for the simple reason that the original *ṛ* itself is barred from becoming Pluta by the very rule P. 8. 2. 86: गुरोरनृतोऽनन्त्यस्याप्येकैकस्य प्राचाम् (where अनृतः = ऋद्भिन्नस्य). If *ṛ* could not become Pluta, how could *ḷ*? The protagonist of the Pari. could return the compliment, saying [भवतोऽपि] ... विस्मृतिरेव!

(*p.* 16, *l.* 11) ऋकारोप्यत्र षष्ठ्या निर्दिष्टः. The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : ऋकारोऽप्यत्र षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टः। कथम्? अविभक्तिको निर्देशः। कृप उः रः लः 'कृपो रो लः' इति। The protagonist of the Pari. (in its modified form) shows how *ṛ* in the Genitive is actually mentioned in P. 8. 2. 18 : कृपो रो लः, so that *ananyatva* is there and so there is no difficulty about Pluta. (He too either forgets or ignores that *ṛ* itself is not eligible for Pluta!)

The mention of *ṛ* in the Genitive (i. e. *ur* / *uḥ*) is demonstrated by resorting to one of the usual tricks of interpretation, viz. *avibhaktika-nirdeśa*. The word *kṛpo* is not a simple Genitive sing. of *kṛp*. It is = *kṛpa* (= $\sqrt{}$*kṛp*; the *a* is only *uccāraṇārthaka*) [+ *ṅas* dropped] + *uḥ* (Geni. sing. of *ṛ*). It means : 'In the place of *ṛ*, belonging to $\sqrt{}$*kṛp*, *r* is replaced by *l*'. In effect this means that in the forms of *kṛp*, where there is a consonantal *r*, it is replaced by the consonantal *l* (e. g. *karpate* > *kalpate*) and a vocalic *ṛ* by a vocalic *ḷ* (*kṛpta* > *kḷpta*).

(*p*. 16, *l*. 11) सौत्रो निर्देशः, 'सुपां सुलुक्' इति. This is meant to justify the unusual *avibhaktika* form in the Sū. The case endings are sometimes dropped (*suluk*) in the Chandas as Pāṇini has noted in his rule : *supāṁ suluk* etc. (7. 1. 39) and it is well known that the Sūtras often resemble Chandas — छन्दोवत् सूत्राणि भवन्ति, as Pat. says (*Mbh*. I. 37. 4) — (*p*. 16, *l*. 12) उरिति च संबन्ध ... संबन्धाच्च कल्पकारादिषु. Bhar. says that the Genitive in *ur* (*us*/*uḥ*) is to be understood as conveying relationship in general. So sometimes it refers to *r* which is directly related to it as a part, e. g. *kṛpta* > *kḷpta* where *r* is a part of *ṛ*. Sometimes it refers to *r* which is indirectly connected with it (संबद्धसंबन्ध, lit. 'connection with the connected), e. g. in the forms which show Guṇa; thus *karpate* > *kalpate*, or *karpaka* > *kalpaka*. the *r* which we see in these forms is connected with *ṛ* (of the root *kṛp*) only indirectly. The *prakriyā* will make this clear. At the stage *kṛp*+*śap*+*te* the Guṇa by P. 7. 3. 86 : पुगन्तलघूपधस्य च takes precedence because P. 8. 2. 18 teaching the substitution *r* > *l* is in the *asiddha* section. Now of the three phonemes called Guṇa, *a*, *e*, *o*, it is *a* which will materialize as Guṇa, being nearest to the *sthānin* *ṛ*. Now this *a* will not come alone, but it will be followed by *r* by P. 1. 1. 51 : उरण् रपरः; in other words it is अर्. Now this *r* is not directly connected with *ṛ* of *kṛp* as its part. It is only indirectly connected with it through *a* which is the Guṇa. (कृपिस्थस्य ऋकारस्य गुणादेशत्वेन संबद्धः यः अकारः तेन संबद्धः 'उरण् रपरः' इत्यत्र निर्दिष्टो रेफः इत्यर्थः ।) But this does not matter.

Observations : (1) Actually, कृपो रो लः is a simple Sūtra consisting of three constituents, meaning '*r* of *kṛp* is replaced by *l*'. Here *r* and *l* stand for both the consonantal *r* and *l* and also their vocalic counterparts, *ṛ* and *ḷ* respectively.

(2) The extraction of *us* (*ur*, *uḥ*) — Geni. sing. of *ṛ* — is not at all necessary for this purpose. If Pat. does it, it is for an altogether extraneous reason.

(3) But once this extraction is done in the *Mbh*, there comes in a problem of interpretation, which the commentators have to face. How is *uḥ raḥ* '*r* belonging to *ṛ*' applicable to both kinds of *r*, one occurring independently (the consonantal *r* in the Guṇa form) as well as to *r* which is a part of *ṛ* ?

(4) According to Bhar., the relationship indicated by the Genitive *us* is to be understood in a general way. When the weak forms where *ṛ* > *ḷ* are concerned, *r* is a part of *ṛ*, and so is directly connected with it. When, however, the Guṇa forms are concerned, *r* (of *ar*) is only indirectly connected with the original *ṛ*, viz. through *a* (the Guṇa proper).

(5) Bhaṭṭoji in his *Sid-Kau*. follows a different course. According to him कृपो is to be repeated : once as it is, and then as equivalent to कृप + उस्. The first

part simply means that *r* of *kṛp* is replaced by *l*. This applies to consonantal *r* (*karpate* > *kalpate*). The second part means that *r* which is a part of *ṛ* is replaced by *l* (ultimately the whole becoming *ḷ*). Read: कृपो रो लः । ··· कृप उः इति छेदः । कृपेति लुप्तषष्ठीकम् । तच्चावर्तते । कृपो यो रेफस्तस्य लः स्यात् । कृपेर्ऋकारस्यावयवो यो रेफसदृशस्तस्य च लृकारसदृशः स्यात् । (Strictly *r* and *l*, which are parts of *ṛ* and *ḷ*, are not regarded as identical with the independent consonantal phonemes *r* and *l*. Hence Bhaṭṭoji's words रेफसदृशः and लकारसदृशः.).

(*p.* 16, *l.* 14) नकारान्तग्रहणमिति. Having shown that *ṛ* is mentioned in the Genitive in P. 8. 2. 18, the protagonist of the Pari. reverts to the original form of the Pari. and says that even this original wording will do; it is not necessary to add षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टस्य. At this the opponent reminds him that in that case elision of *a* in the word *rājakīya* will be inevitable. To this the advocate of the Pari. replies thus: नैष दोषः । वक्ष्यत्येतत् — 'श्वादीनां संप्रसारणे नकारान्तग्रहणमनकारान्तप्रतिषेधार्थम्' इति । तत् प्रकृतमुत्तरत्रानुवर्तिष्यते — 'अल्लोपोऽनः' नकारान्तस्येति । This *Mbh.* is referred to by the *Dīp.* with the *pratīka* नकारान्तग्रहणमिति.

What the *Mbh.* means is this: P. 6. 4. 133: श्वयुवमघोनामतद्धिते teaches Saṁprasāraṇa for words like श्वन् under certain circumstances. In order to avoid over-application of this rule Kāty. has a *Vār.* (No. 1) on it, श्वादीनां प्रसारणे नकारान्तग्रहणम् etc., which seeks to restrict the Saṁprasāraṇa, so that it will take place only when श्वन् etc. actually end in *n*, not otherwise (so there is no Saṁprasāraṇa in मघवता, युवतीः etc.). Pat. now says that the expression नकारान्तस्य will be continued in our Sū. अल्लोपोऽनः (P. 6. 4. 134) which immediately follows. So no danger of *allopa* in *rājakīya*, as *rājak* does not end in *n*. — (*p.* 16, *l.* 14) राजकीये नान्तत्वं ... व्यपदिश्यत. Similarly Kaiy.: न च राजन्-शब्दः कादेशे कृते नकारान्तो भवति, श्वेव पुच्छे छिन्ने न पुच्छवानिति भावः.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 15) इह तर्हि क्लृप्तशिखः ... विकृत इति. Objection against the application of the dictum एकदेश°. The phoneme *ḷ* will have to go without the Pluta here, since the *ekadeśin*, i. e. *ṛ* itself is excluded from prolation by the original rule गुरोरनृतो ... (P. 8. 2. 86).

(*p.* 16, *l.* 16) अरवत इति वक्ष्यामि. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.*: 'रवत्प्रतिषेधाच्च' (वा. ५)। रवत्प्रतिषेधाच्चैतत् सिध्यति। 'गुरोररवतः...' इति वक्ष्यामि।

The protagonist of the Pari. is tenacious. In order to maintain the Pari. he is prepared to emend the rule P. 8. 2. 86. In the place of *anṛtaḥ* 'not of *ṛ*', he proposes to read *aravataḥ* 'not of (a vowel) containing *r*'. He thus seeks to have best of both the worlds. By the very same Pari. एकदेशविकृतम् etc., *ḷ* is regarded as *ṛ* itself and so there is the *ac* status necessary for the Pluta. And, since *ḷ* does not contain a *r*, the prohibition (*aravataḥ*) does not apply to it. Here one may ask: But will not रेफवत्ता also be there in *ḷ*, like the *ac* status, on

the basis of the Pari. itself ? It is said that it does not happen so, as it is against the worldly practice. Read the *Śabda-Kaustubha* : न ह्येकदेशविकृतन्यायेन रेफवत्ता-प्यायाति । लोकेऽपि हि छिन्नपुच्छस्य पुच्छवत्त्वप्रयुक्तं कार्यं नायात्येव ।

(*p.* 16, *l.* 16) ननु च मतुपा ... विषाणीत्यत्र. This *Dīp.* discusses the propriety of the form *aravat* which is formed with the possessive suffix *matup*. It is claimed that *matup* has no place here, the implied argument being that a Bahuvrīhi compound (*arasya*) would have been more in place. Cf. the maxim न कर्मधारयान्मत्वर्थीयो बहुव्रीहिश्चेत् तदर्थप्रतिपत्तिकरः । Actually the maxim does not strictly apply here, because the stem (of *matup*) is not a Karmadhāraya. But, apparently, the maxim is intended to be understood in spirit, not in letter. The reply given is that it is not so. The Bahuvrīhi denotes possession in general while the possessive suffix *matup* has some special denotations in addition. One of them is the possession of something as a limb or a part (as e. g. the word *viṣāṇin*[1]) to denote which (विशेषप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम्) here the noun *ravat* with the *matup* is used in preference to the Bahuvrīhi *ara*.

The *Dīp.* also points out the undesirable result which would follow, had Kāty. used *arasya* instead of *aravataḥ*. The prohibition of Pluta would have applied in that case even to a word like *vartaka* in which *a* (before *r*) would be prevented from becoming Pluta, because it has a *r* in its vicinity. But that is not desired. The prohibition is desired only where *r* is an integral part of a vowel (*ac*), viz. *ṛ*. So since the possession (of *r*) in a particular form, viz. as a part, is desired (तस्मादवयवत्वेन तद्वत्ता प्रदश्यते), *matup* is preferred to Bahuvrīhi. The whole idea is very clearly expressed by Kaiy. thue : अरवत इति । रोऽस्यास्ति नित्यमिति नित्ययोगे मतुप् । तेन ऋकार एव रवान्, तु वर्तक इत्यादावकारः । न रवान् अरवानिति समासः । नित्ययोगप्रतिपादनाय बहुव्रीहिर्न कृतो 'गुरोररस्य ...' इति ।

It will be seen that the only difference between Bhar. and Kaiy. is that according to Bhar. अवयवत्वेन तद्वत्ता is the meaning of *matup* here while according to Kaiy. it is *nityayoga* 'permanent relation'. It may be mentioned incidentally that Nāg. also thinks that the meaning *avayava* is sufficient here and he criticises Kaiy. for 'running right up to the *nityayoga*.' Read the *Uddy.* : रोऽस्यास्तीति । इदं चिन्त्यम्, अवयवादावेव मत्वर्थो नानन्तरादाविति वर्तक इत्यादौ रवत्त्वस्योपपादयितुमशक्यत्वान्नित्ययोगपर्यन्तधावनमफलमिति ।

1. It means a particular animal possessed of *viṣāṇa*, viz. either an elephant (who has tusks) or a bull (who has horns). A person carrying a tusk or horn in hand will not be called a *viṣāṇin*. Read also the *Mbh.-Dīp.* Āhnika VI, part I, (ed. V. B. Bhagavat and Saroja Bhate, pub. BORI, 1986), p. 2, ll. 19-22 : मत्वर्थीयाश्च केचित् स्वस्वामिभावमात्रविषया यथा गोमानिति । ... कश्चिद्युतसंसर्गविषयो यथा विषाणीति । न हि मुण्डो गौर्विषाणे ग्रीवायामासक्ते 'विषाणी' इति भवति ।

Observation : The MS clearly reads अरवत (in line 17), and it is retained in the eds. But this is definitely erroneous. The *Dīp.* is here explaining why Kāty. preferred *matup* to the other alternative formation, viz. the Bahuvrīhi, by pointing out the difficulty that would arise in cases like *vartaka* if the Bahuvrīhi compound had been employed. True, Bhar. nowhere mentions expressly either the word *samāsa* or *Bahuvrīhi*. But this is due to his characteristic, somewhat loose way of writing and there is no doubt as to what he really means. This becomes certain when we read Kaiy's remark quoted above. So I have suggested the emendation अरस्य for the MS अरवत. I want to draw attention to the fact that Kaiy. has actually expressly mentioned the form अरस्य.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 19) अत्र त्विदमुच्यते ... त्यत्र प्रश्लेषव्यः. Here Bhar. anticipates a possible objection against the above argument and himself suggests a solution. It was said above that the Bahuvrīhi has a wide range of meaning, that it could include, among the meaning (possessed objects), even something which happened to be in close vicinity (*anantara*), that as such the prohibition of Pluta would apply undesiredly even to *a* preceding *r* in *vartaka* for instance, and therefore Kāty. had to set aside the Bahuvrīhi. It is now suggested that this is not quite true. The *Mbh.* says that Bahuvrīhi should not be formed when the meaning *anantara* is intended. Read : यदि तर्ह्यतिप्रसङ्गाः सन्ति बहुव्रीहावप्यस्तिग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्, अस्तियुक्ताद्यथा स्याद् अनन्तरादियुक्तान् मा भूदिति (*Mbh.* on P. 5. 2. 94; II. 392. 10–11). Since Bahuvrīhi does not denote *anantara*, there is no possibility of the Bahuvrīhi *ara* meaning 'that in whose vicinity there is no *r*'. Thus there is no danger of the prohibition of Pluta applying to *vartaka*. Why did then Kāty. set it aside and use the rather irregular (and also lengthier; this should not be ignored) *aravataḥ* with *matup* ?

Bhar. admits the force of the argument. But, he seems to think, the fact remains that *aravat* has been used. It is a *fait accompli*. Also *aravat* is not a solitary case. There are other words where a possessive Taddhita suffix is added superfluously, where Bahuvrīhi would have sufficed. सर्वबीजी, सर्वकेशी etc. Let अरवत् also be recognized as one of them. Cf. the *Mbh.* on P. 2. 1. 69 : 'कदाचित् कर्मधारयः सर्वधनाद्यर्थः' (वा. ५) । कदाचित् कर्मधारयो भवति बहुव्रीहेः । किं प्रयोजनम् ? सर्वधनाद्यर्थः । सर्वधनी सर्वबीजी । सर्वकेशी नटः । गौरखरवदरण्यम् । गौरमृगवदरण्यम् । कृष्णसर्पवान् वल्मीकः । लोहितशालिमान् ग्रामः (*Mbh.* I. 403. 20–24) । Here Bhar. was expected to use सर्वधनी since that is the word which appears in the *Vār*. Cf. also Pat's use असुब्वतोऽङ्गस्य (III. 323. 19) under P. 7. 3. 44 : प्रत्ययस्थात् कात् ... etc.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 20) स एष सूत्रभेदेन. Here Bhar. skips over one argument which occurs in the *Mbh.* The protagonist of ऌकारोपदेश points out that the reading of *aravataḥ* will prevent ṝ in *hotṝkāra* from being Pluta since ṝ is equally *ravat*. The advocate of the Pari. then says that he will add a word *hrasvasya*

to the Pari, so that the prohibition will apply to r only, not to $\bar{r}$. The advocate of ऌकारोपदेश ridicules him for this argument, saying: स एष सूत्रभेदेन ऌकारोपदेशः प्लुत्याद्यर्थः सन् प्रत्याख्यायते, सैषा महतो वंशस्तम्बाल्लट्वानुकृष्यते. The attempt of the protagonist of the Pari. to dispense with the ऌकारोपदेश, meant for accounting Pluta etc., by tampering with the Sūtra (गुरोरनृतो ... etc.) is as ridiculous as the attempt of a person to take the risk of climbing a high clump of bamboos, just to catch a small sparrow! It is a penny wise pound foolish policy!

The *Dīp.* अन्यार्थोयमन्य उपदेष्टव्य इति (which is itself illegible in the MS) and रूपस्य साम्यात् तया क्रियया साम्यमस्य is not clear. Of course तया क्रियया means महतो वंशस्तम्बाल्लट्वानुकर्षणक्रियया and अस्य means ऌकारोपदेशप्रत्याख्यानस्य, but some portion seems to have been lost between वंशस्तम्बादिति and रूपस्य.

Readings: (1) (*p.* 16, *l.* 3). Although the MS clearly writes श्वनि, it is unthinkable that a grammarian like Bhar. will write such an incorrect form. So it semendation to शुनि in the eds. is perfectly right. — (2) (*p.* 16, *l.* 5) The MS seems to read राक्ककायसित्य° which AL read as (राज्ञः क च) राजकीयमिति । अ°, Sw as राज्ञः क चेति, अ°. — (3) (*p.* 16, *l.* 6) Sw unnecessarily read इति as स्यात् and takes it as *Dīp.* v. l. for प्राप्नोति of the *Mbh.* Ed. — (4) (*p.* 16, *l.* 9) MSAL षष्ठ्या. — (5) (*p.* 16, *l.* 9) MSSw राजशब्द स्यात् नशब्दः. See Notes for the words to be supplied here. — (6) (*p.* 16, *l.* 10) Sw षष्ठी- (also in line 11). — (7) (*p.* 16, *l.* 13) MS सबधसंबद्धाच, AL संबन्धसंबन्धत्वाच. —(8) (*p.* 16, *l.* 13) MS कल्पकारादिषु. AL unnecessarily emend it into कपिलकादिषु which serves no purpose. I am inclined to accept Pandit V. B Bhagavat Shastri's suggestion that कल्पकादिषु might have been the original reading. The main point is that an example with Guṇa (*ar*>*al*) is meant. कपिलकादिषु, as said above, serves no purpose here. — (9) (*p.* 16, *l.* 16) MS ननु च मतुपात्र भवितव्यं. The context requires a न in this sentence. So AL emend च into न (which is not objectionable, seeing that the scribe sometimes does write च for न). Sw supplies (न) after च. As ननु च is a usual Sanskrit idiom, I also retain it and supply न. Only I supply it before भवितव्यम् as being more natural. — (10) (*p.* 16, *l.* 17) MSAL Sw अरवत. For my emendation अरस्य, see Notes. — (11) (*p.* 16, *l.* 18) MS इत्यस्यमाने, Sw इत्यस्य (वर्त)माने (for इत्युच्यमाने as emended by AL). — After इत्युच्यमाने, AL read, evidently through oversight, होतृ ऋकार (from the *Mbh.*) इत्यत्रापि instead of वर्तकेत्यत्रापि. — (12) (*p.* 16, *ll.* 18-19) MS अवयनेन, AL °यत्रेन (for अवयवत्वेन as in Sw). AL प्रदर्श्यते. — (13) (*p.* 16, *l.* 19) MS Sw विषाणी(MS °ण)त्यत्र द्विदमुच्यते, AL °णीति अत्र । तद्वत् इदमु°. I have made two emendations: (1) In spite of the MS, I read a *daṇḍa* after विषाणीति and begin a fresh sentence with अत्र. (2) For द्विदम् (which is evidently corrupt) I read त्विदम्. The तु here fits in quite well, since this sentence sounds a note of dissent with the previous one. — (14) (*p.* 16, *l.* 20) MS सवबाजा is correctly emended into सर्वबीजी in the eds.

e o Ṅ / ai au C // 3, 4

Two questions are discussed under these two Sūtras :

(1) Whether these speech-sounds should be kept as they are, or whether they should be read with a (restrictive) *t* after them (" इदं विचार्यते । इमानि संध्यक्षराणि तपराणि वोपदिश्येरन् — 'एत् ओत् ङ्' 'ऐत् औत् च्' इति, अतपराणि वा यथान्यासम्" *Mbh.*).

(2) Do the parts — or the so-called parts — of these diphthongs behave like their independent counterparts (" य एते वर्णेषु वर्णैकदेशा वर्णान्तरसमानाकृतय एतेषामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं स्याद्वा न वा " *Mbh.*).

[1]

(*p.* 16, *l.* 24) उपदिश्यमानता तपरातपरविषया ... इदमा संबध्यते. Before coming to the main topic, Bhar. discusses a minor question here. It is about the syntax of the *Mbh.* passage इदं विचार्यते । ... वा यथान्यासम् । Apparently there is nothing irregular in the construction as far as a common man is concerned. But grammarians have their own ways of looking at it. This is the objection : In इदं विचार्यते, the pronoun इदम् is the object of the act of consideration. What that इदम् refers to is told in the entire next sentence (इमानि संध्यक्षराणि ... यथान्यासम्). In other words the uttering of the diphthongs with or without a *t* is sort of in apposition with इदम्. How do you justify this ? इदम् is a pronoun and so expects a substantive. The next sentence इमानि संध्यक्षराणि, however, expresses an activity (uttering with or without *t*) which is in process (उपदिश्यता ... उच्यते). It is not concrete (असत्त्वभूत-). Naturally this sentence is not a substantive. How can you then connect it with इदम् ? And also, to put it in another way, how can it be an object of विचार्यते ?

The reply (नैष दोषः ... etc.) is given on the basis of the two stages of meaning. In the expressed stage the individual words convey their own (word)-meanings. This is susceptible to various kinds of differentiation, tangible (*sattvabhūta*) or intangible (*asattvabhūta*), and accordingly expressed by various kinds of suitable words, noun, verb etc. The problem of connection or construction pertains to only this plane. But when the meaning is in the other stage, mental or conceptual meaning (called *bauddha artha* elsewhere), these distinctions disappear and the whole is one, being one with the mind-stuff (आत्मरूपेण विद्यते). It is sort of one substance. How can it then be not connected with the content of इदम् ? (I have tried to give a literal interpretation of the *Dīp.* . In fact, I am not sure how far I have understood Bhar.'s idea clearly.) As usual, Kaiy. expresses the idea briefly thus : इदं विचार्यते । तपरातपरसंध्यक्षरोपदेशो विचार्यत इत्यर्थः । तत्रोपदिश्येरन्नित्यत्रासत्त्वभूता यद्यपि क्रियाभिधीयते, तथापि बुद्ध्या परामृष्टा सत्त्वरूपतामापादिता विचारक्रियायां कर्मभावमनुभवति । यथा, 'पश्य, मृगो धावति' इति सरणं दर्शने ।

In the *Dīp.*, यो हि means यो हि शब्दार्थः· तथाभूतेन = नामाख्यातादन्यतम-रूपेण तत्तदर्थानुरूपेण. The subject of उपस्थापयति is शब्दः understood. In आत्म-रूपेण, the word *ātman* is rather in the sense of *manas* or *buddhi*. असत्त्वशब्देन, by a non-substantive word. Between असत्त्वशब्देनोच्यमानः and सत्त्वभूतः, scil. अनपाश्रितशब्दोपादान आत्मरूपेऽवस्थितः सन्. — A तु seems necessary between यदा and वस्तुरूपं.

पचत्यपत्यम् and its amplification पचतेस्तस्यापत्यम् (MS) are obscure. Pt. Bhagavat Shastri suggests that the second passage may be originally पचति [य]स्तस्यापत्यम्. I follow the suggestion provisionally in the translation.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 16, *l.* 25) MS संबंधत्वा°, Sw संबन्धस्या° (for संबद्धत्वा° as in AL). — (2) (*p.* 16, *l.* 26) Sw reads MS पचत्यपत्यम् as पचत्ययम् (but later on, *l.* 28, he retains अपत्यम्), — (3) (*p.* 16, *l.* 27) AL read MS सर्वोर्थो as सर्वोऽप्यर्थो. — (4) (*p.* 16, *l.* 27) MSAL संभन्स्यति (for संभन्स्यते as in Sw). The passive requires Ātmanepada. — (5) (*p.* 17, *l.* 1) MS Sw [ऽ]पाश्रित-, AL ऽनाश्रित-. I emend the text into अनपाश्रित-.

[2]

कार्यगतं विशेषं पृच्छति. Similarly Kaiy. : कार्ये को विशेषः इति प्रश्नः. Nāg. brings out the exact significance : पक्षद्वये स्वरूपवैलक्षण्यस्यानुभवसिद्धत्वेन तद्विषयः प्रश्नोऽनुचितोऽत आह — कार्ये इति। The three *Vār*-s (1) संध्यक्षरेषु...च्चारणम्, (2) प्लुत्यादिष्वज्विधिः and (3) प्लुतसंज्ञा च point out three defects in the तपरपक्ष.

[2. 1]

केयं वाचोयुक्तिः ... तपरोपदेशश्चेत् तपरोच्चारणमिति. There is apparently a tautology in saying तपरोपदेशश्चेत् तपरोच्चारणम् since उपदेश = उच्चारण on the authority of the *Mbh.* quoted. Hence the question. वाचोयुक्तिः (an *aluk* compound formed according to P. 6. 3. 21 *Vār*. 1 : षष्ठीप्रकरणे वाग्दिक्पश्यद्भ्यो युक्तिदण्डहरेषूपसंख्यानम्) means 'a mode of expression, an idiom'.

In the *Dīp. p.* 17, *ll.* 8–13, three alternative explanations are given to show that there is no tautology. (1) उच्यते। एतत् ... तपरोच्चारणं कर्तव्यम्. Bhar. here says that whatever is taught in the system finds a place in the actual utterance, unless deleted by some rule. So the *Vār*. says that if the Akṣara-samāmnāya originally read the diphthongs with *t*, they will always be followed by *t*, for there is no rule which teaches that the *t* is deleted (तकारस्योपदेशे सति निवर्तकलक्षणं नास्ति). In this explanation उपदेशः and उच्चारणम् still remain synonymous, still there is no tautology because the agents of the two are different, the Sūtrakāra in the case of *upadeśa* and the reader in the case of *uccāraṇam*. — (*p.* 17, *l.* 9) यथा यादी चुञ्चुप्-चणपौ. This illustrates अन्येषामुपदेशश्च ... न श्रूयन्ते. The two suffixes चुञ्चु(प्) and चण(प्), meaning 'celebrated for' are taught

in P. 5. 2. 26 : तेन वित्तश्चुञ्चुप्-चणपौ. Now these two are Taddhita suffixes. So the inital *c* of these aught to be deleted by P. 1. 3. 7 : चुटू and 9 तस्य लोपः. But they are not. This has given quite a head-ache to the commentators. Among the many explanations advanced in the *Mbh.* for this retention of *c* in the actual forms, one is that the original suffixes are *y-cuñcu-p* and *y-caṇa-p* and that the initial *y* in both is dropped according to p. 6. 1. 66 : लोपो व्योर्वलि. Read the *Mbh.* on चुटू, P. 1. 3. 7 : एवं तर्हि यकारादी चुञ्चुप्-चणपौ। किं यकारो न श्रूयते? लुप्तनिर्दिष्टो यकारः (I. 263. 17–18). One is almost led to feel that historically *cuñcu* and *caṇa* (borrowed words?) were nominal forms which were later reduced to suffixes by grammarians. But in this process, it seems, it was lost sight of, that the intial *c* would, in the grammatical system, assume the character of *it* and that it would have to be consequently deleted. Hence the desperate attempts to explain its retention.

(*p.* 17, *l.* 9) तकारस्योपदेशे सति निवर्तकलक्षणं नास्ति. This sentence poses a problem. Why does Bhar. say that there is no rule which would sanction the deleting of *t*? Will not P. 1. 3. 9 : तस्य लोपः suffice? Perhaps Bhar. wants to say that *t* will not be final in those Sūtras (in the first it is *ṅ*, in the second, *c*), and as it will not have the name *it* in that case, it cannot be dropped by P. 1. 3. 9. For *y-cuñcup* and *y-caṇap*, there is a provision, viz. P. 6. 1. 66, but no such provision for this *t*. Sw reads निर्वर्तन्ते (for निवृत्तिस्ते) and निर्वर्तकलक्षणं (for निवर्तक°). This makes no sense. Indeed, तकारस्योपदेशे सति निर्वर्तकलक्षणं नास्ति involves self-contradiction. That is why Sw has to read तकारस्योपदेशेसति as °देशे असति (with an अकारप्रश्लेष). But this directly contradicts the *Vār.* which says : तपरोपदेशश्चेत्. It is true that the MS itself reads here निर्वर्तकलक्षणं, but it must be taken as a scribal error. Cf. the MS reading निवर्तते (Sw निर्वर्तन्ते) for our निवृत्तिस्ते.

(2) In the second interpretation (*Dīp. p.* 17, *ll.* 10–12), Bhar. suggests that उपदेश should be understood in the sense of गुणैः प्रापणम्, i. e. making known something through its characteristic qualities. If this meaning is understood, then there is no tautology. Bhar. says that if the diphthongs are read with a suffixed *t*, the diphthongs are not known in this character (तपराणि तानि न च प्राप्यन्तेऽतपराणि उच्चारितानि) unless they are actually uttered with the suffixed *t*. For the difference which is generally made between उपदेश and उद्देश, read the *Mbh.* : प्रत्यक्षमाख्यानमुपदेशः। गुणैः प्रापणमुद्देशः। ... तद्यथा — अगोज्ञाय कश्चिद् गां सक्थनि कर्णे वा गृहीत्वा उपदिशति 'अयं गौः' इति। स प्रत्यक्षमाख्यातमाह 'उपदिष्टो मे गौः' इति। गुणैः प्रापणमुद्देशः। तद्यथा — कश्चित् कंचिद् आह 'देवदत्तं मे भवानुद्दिशतु' इति। स इहस्थः पाटलिपुत्रस्थं देवदत्तमुद्दिशति 'अङ्गदी कुण्डली किरीटी व्यूढोरस्को वृत्तबाहुर्लोहिताक्षस्तुङ्गनासिको विचित्राभरण ईदृशो देवदत्तः' इति। स गुणैः प्राप्यमाणमाह 'उद्दिष्टो मे देवदत्तः' इति। After some discussion, Pat. reverses the definitions and says : लक्षणेनापि ह्युपदेशः। संकीर्णावुद्देशोपदेशौ। प्रत्यक्ष-

मप्याख्यानमुद्देशः। गुणैश्च प्रापणमुपदेशः। and illustrates them (*Mbh.* under P. 1. 3. 2 : उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत्). Bhar. practically quotes this last sentence of the *Mbh.* when he says : अथ वा गुणैरपि परिप्रापणमुपदेशः.

(3) In this interpretation (*Dīp. p.* 17, *ll.* 12–13) उपदेश is to be understood in the sense of उपदेशफल,[1] i. e. the gain of reading the diphthongs with *t*. If the gain is desired (तपरफलं चेदिष्टं मन्यसे), they have to be read with a suffixed *t*. Of these three alternative explanations, Kaiy. gives only this last one : यद्यप्युपदेश उच्चारणं, तथापि तपरोपदेशे फलं चेदस्ति ततस्तपरोच्चारणं कर्तव्यमित्यर्थः।

[2. 1. 1]

Kaiy. practically repeats the *Dīp.* Read the *Prad.* ; संध्यक्षराणीत्यन्वर्था पूर्वाचार्यसंज्ञा, संधीयमानावयवत्वात्. In the *Dīp.* अस्याः would have been perhaps better than तेषां.

[2. 1. 2]

The following topics are discussed in this section : (1) should the *t* be read after all the four diphthongs or after *e* and *ai* only ? (2) On the first alternative, how will *t* after *o* and *au* have the name *it*, as it is not the final consonant ? And, on the second alternative, how can *o* and *au* be regarded as *tapara* ? (3) What is the utility at all of this *t* getting the name *it* ? (4) What is the exact relationship here between the name and the named ? (5) If only *e* and *ai* are read with *t*, how will *o* and *au* be benefited by it ? (6) What prevents expressions like *at* from being misunderstood as a *pratyāhāra* of *a* with *t* (of the diphthongs) ? There is, however, no clear cut discussion, step by step. The various points are often mixed and it is sometimes difficult to ascertain which view Bhar. prefers.

(1) (*p.* 17, *l.* 16) सर्वाण्येव तपराणि कर्तव्यानि. That is, as एत् ओत् ङ्। ऐत् औत् च्. The *Mbh.* is aware of only this possibility. एकारैकारावेव, i. e. as एत् ओ ङ्। ऐत् औ च्. This possibility is not mentioned in the *Mbh.*

(2) (*p.* 17, *l.* 19) In एत् ओत् ङ् and ऐत् औत् च् the letters ङ् and च् are final. As त् is not final in ओत् ङ् and औत् च्, how can it be *it* by P. 1. 3. 3 : हलन्त्यम् ? As regards the त् after ए and ऐ, it can be regarded as the final of ए and ओ. Here only a doubt is raised. The full discussion is resumed later (4, 5).

(3) (*p.* 17, *l.* 20). A question is asked about the utility of the name *it* to *t* here, followed by a reply. The *Dīp.* apparently explains why the name *it*

1. Nāg. remarks : संप्रदाने घञ् इति भावः। फलस्यैव करणत्वविवक्षया करणे घञ् इत्यन्ये।

has to be accepted for *t* in the diphthongs (तस्मादस्ति तपरेष्वित्संज्ञा इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम्). But the passage is hopelessly obscure. I suspect that some portion of the text may have been lost, hapl, or otherwise. Only one small part of the passage, viz. तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणमिह मा भूत् 'दिव औत्' इति seems to make sense.

Here the *Dīp.* is evidently referring to the *Vār.* तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणम् on P. 6. 1. 185 : तित्स्वरितम्. Kāt. here suggests that प्रत्यय should be added to the Sū., so that not any other word-element, but only a suffix, if furnished with a code-letter *t*, has a Svarita accent. The *Dīp.* says that औत् in दिव औत् (P. 7. 1. 84) is taught as a substitute of the stem *div* (when the Nom. sing ending *-s* follows). We can take this clue for reconstructing a part of the argument. A question is asked: what is the utility of the name *it* for *t* (किं पुनस्तकारस्येत्संज्ञया प्रयोजनम्) ? The protagonist of तकारस्येत्संज्ञा probably replied: For the Svarita accent for the diphthongs in the list. 'But that is impossible. Kāty. has ruled that only a suffix can be Svarita. And isolated diphthongs in the Akṣarasamāmnāya are not a suffix', protests the opponent. 'There you are', says the advocate of तकारस्येत्संज्ञा, 'so you admit that the diphthongs have the code-letter *t*. That's all that I want (तस्मादस्ति तपरेष्वित्संज्ञा इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम्). I don't care if they get the Svarita accent or not'. — I am indebted to Pt. V. B. Bhagavat Shastri for this suggestion.

(4) (*p.* 17, *l.* 23) अतो[1] 'दिव औत्' इति यदुच्चार्यते ... संज्ञी कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते The *Dīp.* here says that औत् in दिव औत् has a *t* which is *it*. This expression *aut* (in the Sū.) is what is technically called *pratyāyaka* (which does not undergo any operation). The identical form which is conveyd (called *pratyāyya*) undergoes the operation (= becomes the substitute, here). The *pratyāyaka* is the *saṁjñā*, the *pratyāyya*, the *saṁjñin*. For the idea that it is always the *pratyāyya* which undergoes the operation, and not the *pratyāyaka*, cf. the *Vāk.* (I. 61–62) :

> यो य उच्चार्यते शब्दो नियतं न स कार्यभाक् ।
> अन्यप्रत्यायने शक्तिर्न तस्य प्रतिबध्यते ॥ ६१ ॥
>
> उच्चरन् परतन्त्रत्वाद् गुणः कार्यैर्न युज्यते ।
> तस्माद् तदर्थैः कार्याणां संबन्धः परिकल्प्यते ॥ ६२ ॥

The *Vṛtti* on 61 : प्रत्यायको हि परार्थमुच्चारितो यदर्थमुच्चारितः तं कार्येषु नियुङ्क्ते, तत्र कार्याण्यासजति ... etc.

1. The significance of the word अतो is not clear. The designation *it* for *t* (in *diva aut*) does not depend on what is said in the *Dīp.* before. It is already independently provided for in P. 1. 3. 3 : हलन्त्यम्.

In the *Dīp.* (line 23), after यद्, scil. तवर्णम्. तिता refers to औत् where औ is furnished with a code-letter *t*. औत् read in the Sū. is called *saṁjñā* and औत् which is understood from it and so actually participates in the grammatical operation is called *saṁjñin* on the authority of P. 1. 1. 68 : स्वं रूपं शब्दस्याशब्दसंज्ञा.

(*p.* 17, *l.* 24) अस्ति, तत्र ... कथमिव स्यात्। The exact significance of this passage is not clear. Perhaps it is suggested in the previous *Dīp.* that along with कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते, additional इत्त्वं प्रतिपद्यते is also to be understood. This transference of इत्त्वं is now challenged in the case of ओत्+औत् of the Akṣarasamāmnāya. This *Dīp.* points out the difference in the two cases. There, in दिव औत्, the suffixion of *t* does not have any other function. It is just मुखसुखार्थं. Here, in the Akṣarasamāmnāya, on the other hand, its force is already exhausted by indicating the तत्कालग्रहण, which is its main function. संज्ञिनि=औकारे। तद्व्यपदेशस्य = 'तित्' इति व्यपदेशस्य. — (*p.* 17, *l.* 26) अनेकार्थत्वात् ... वृद्ध्यर्थः स्वरार्थश्च. There is no conflict in the discharge of many functions by one code-letter if they are assigned to it in grammar. In the Taddhita suffix *ṭhak* (= *ika*), the code-letter *k* has two functions: It indicates (1) Vṛddhi of the initial syllable of the stem (P. 7. 2. 118 : किति च) and (2) also the Udātta accent on the final syllable (P. 6. 1. 165 : कितः).

(*p.* 18, *l.* 1) इतरेषां हि तपरं ... नास्त्युपदेशाभावात्. This *Dīp.* states a different view about the संज्ञासंज्ञिभाव in the case of the diphthongs held by some others (*itareṣām*). According to this view (1) a diphthong (like *et*, e. g.; the *saṁjñā*) conveys its own form (स्वस्वरूपं) and also the other varieties (the *saṁjñin*-s) of that diphthong with the same duration (तत्कालान्) simultaneously. (2) the *pratyāyaka* (the diphthong as read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) is furnished with a suffixed code-letter *t*, but the *pratyāyya* (the diphthong which actually undergoes grammatical operations) is without it (स त्वतिदेत्र यः तितः कार्यं प्रतिपद्यते). The reason given for this is that you can utter only a *pratyāyaka*; you cannot utter the *pratyāyya*. The moment you utter a *pratyāyya*, it ceases to be a *pratyāyya* and assumes the status of a *pratyāyaka* having, in its turn, another similar form. The *pratyāyya* always remains unuttered. (Cf. the *Vṛtti* on the above-mentioned *Vāk* I. 61 : तस्यापि प्रत्याय्यस्य यदा प्रदर्शनार्थं करणसंनिविष्टस्योच्चारणं क्रियते, तदा तुल्यरूपमन्यप्रतिपाद्यं शब्दान्तरं प्रति न तस्य प्रत्यायकत्वं प्रतिबध्यते). — इतरथा हि etc. If there is no designation *it*, the letter *t* will not be dropped. It will be there permanently in the name. — Once the Upadeśa *et ot* etc. has ceased after conveying its own form, *e*, *o* etc, there is no further *upadeśa* ('उपदेश आद्योच्चारणम्' सि. कौ.). The name *it* is possible only in the *upadeśa* ([उपदेशे] हलन्त्यम् [इत्] पा. १. १. ३).

(*p.* 18, *l.* 6) अथेह कस्मान्न भवति स्वरूपग्रहणम् ... औङ् इति तद्देकदेशस्येति. The question here discussed is this : What prevents *t* of *et* etc. from being understood as a part of the own form (स्वरूपम्) ? And if there is nothing to prevent it, will not *t* appear in the actual linguistic forms ? The answer is given on two alternatives : (1) whether *t* is merely a qualifier (*upalakṣaṇam*) of *e*, *o* etc, which latter alone form the *saṁjñā*-s or (2) *t* is an integral part of *e*, *o* etc. and the whole expressions *et*, *ot* form the *saṁjñā*-s. On the first alternative, *t* being merely a qualifier, there is no possibility of its being included in the 'own form'. So far so good. But then the difficulty is that no case-endings can be used after *et*, *ot* etc. The reason is that in that case *t* has no meaning (it is no better than *kākavāsita*) and so it cannot be a (part of) *prātipadika* which, by definition, has to be meaningful (P. 1. 2. 45: अर्थवत् ... प्रातिपदिकम्). What is not a *prātipadikā*, cannot get a case-ending (P. 4. 1. 1 : ङ्याप्प्रातिपदिकात् ।). So the view आदिः (i. e. *e*, *o* etc.) संज्ञा cannot be accepted. On the other alternative (समुदायः [एत्, ओत् etc.] संज्ञा), true there is *prima facie* the threat of *t* being included in the 'own form'. But it is more apparent than real. For, *t* can be deleted as being a code-letter. — In line 9 some letters after समुदायस्तथा are illegible.

(*p.* 18, *ll.* 9 ff.) The question raised in (2) above is here continued : In *et ot ṅ/ait aut c*, how can *t* in *ot* and *aut* have the name *it*, as the final position is occupied by *ṅ* and *c*, and not by *t* ? And if *t* there is not *it*, it will have to be regarded as an integral part of the *saṁjñā* and *t* still threatens to penetrate into the actual forms. — The *Dīp.* प्रत्याय्यस्तु ... etc. answers this objection. The main point of the answer is that even though *t* may be included in the *saṁjñā* (*pratyāyaka*), it need not be necessarily present in the *saṁjñin* (*pratyāyya*). A parallel is cited of the expression शुक्लवाससा तुल्यपरिमाणमानय (and the expression शुक्लवाससमानय — this is not directly quoted, but merely hinted at). When somebody says : शुक्लवाससमानय 'Bring (the man) with the white garment', there is what is technically called *tadguṇasaṁvijñāna*, i. e. the property of having white clothes is supposed to be included in the act of bringing (*vyāpāre*) the man (technically called the *anyapadārtha*). But in the sentence शुक्लवाससा तुल्यपरिमाणमानय 'Bring (a man) of the same size as (the man) with the white garment', there is no *tadguṇasaṁvijñāna* ; the white garment does not form a part of the man to be brought. It merely serves to identify the other man whose size is important. The man to be brought must have the size of the other man. That's all. He need not have the white garment also. Similarly here too. When there is a *svavyāpāra* of the *saṁjñā*, i. e. when the name is defined (in other words : in the Akṣarasamāmnāya), *t* is included in it. But when there is an अन्योपलक्षणव्यापार, i. e. when the *saṁjñin* is to be conveyed, *t* is not included. So no danger of *t* penetrating to the actual linguistic forms.

(*p.* 18, *l.* 13) अथ वेत्संज्ञायां ... तदेकदेशस्येति. Although it is shown above that even without the designation *it* for *t* in the *saṁjñā*, *t* can be successfully prevented from finding a place in the *saṁjñin*, another solution is now given as an alternative. Some provision can be made for the name *it* in connection with *t* (अथ वेत्संज्ञायां प्रतिविधीयते), so that it could be effectively deleted. The way is found by making a distinction between the part and the whole (समुदायावयवभेदाद्-दोष:). There are two Sūtras: एत् ओत् ङ् and ऐत् औत् च्. Here *ṅ* is the Anubandha of the first whole (*e* and *o*), and *c* of the second whole (*ai* and *au*). As against this, the two *t* letters, viz. after *o* and *au*, are the Anubandhas of the parts only, viz. of *o* and *au* respectively. So they occupy the final positions each, therefore get the name *it*, and are finally dropped.

The sentence यथा सुटष्टकारः समुदायस्य, औङ् इति तदेकदेशस्य (line 15), which is intended to supply a parallel for the name *it* to be given to a consonant which, though not strictly final, can be regarded as final on the basis of the समुदायावयवभेद, is difficult to explain. Here the *Dīp.* says that *ṭ* of *suṭ* is a code-letter of the whole while *ṅ* of *auṅ* is the code-letter of a part (of that whole). Now, there is no difficulty in identifying the *suṭ*. It evidently is a *pratyāhāra* of *su* (Nom. sing.) with *ṭ* of *auṭ* (Acc. dual) comprising the following five case-endings:

(i)	Case	Sing.	Du.	Plu.
	prathamā	*su*	*au*	*jas*
	dvitīyā	*am*	*auṭ*	

This *pratyāhāra* appears in P. 1. 1. 43: सुडनपुंसकस्य. So सुट् is clear. But what is this औङ्? There is no औङ् in this pentad of the case-endings. How is the *Dīp.* reference to be understood?

Here one is at once reminded of a rule of Pāṇini viz. औङ आपः (7. 1. 18: 'The case-ending) *auṅ* (Nom. and Acc. dual) is replaced by *śī* (i. e. *ī*) after a fem. stem in *ā*'). This *auṅ* has been a puzzle to students, as Pāṇini (4. 1. 2) reads only औ and औट्, and no औङ्. There is a long discussion on this in the *Mbh.* and one of the suggestions advanced is that here is a reference to some old grammar which had used the code-letter *ṅ* (निर्देशोऽयं पूर्वसूत्रेण वा स्यात् *Mbh.* III. 247. 16. The *Sid-Kau.* simply says: औङ् इत्यौकारविभक्तेः संज्ञा). Since the substitution *au*>*ī* applies to both the Nom. and the Acc. dual, we have to suppose that a scheme like the following is before Bhar's mind when he advances this parallel:

(ii)	*prathamā*	*su*	*auṅ*	*jas*
	dvitīyā	*am*	*auṅṭ*	

Of course when the *Dīp.* says ङकारः औङ् इति तदेकदेशस्य the reference to the Acc. dual is to be understood. The parallel can be theoretically understood. But

what is its basis in reality ? Are we to understand that Bhar. is actually referring to some pre-Pāṇinian Sanskrit grammar which read the case-endings in the form given above (ii) ? But why should he do so ? And besides, it does not look like that Bhar. is referring to some pre-Pāṇinian grammar. (There is no word like पूर्वसूत्रे.) Or, are we to suppose that Bhar. knew some other version of *Aṣṭ.* in which the case-endings *auṅ* and *auṅṭ* were actually read (उभयथा ह्याचार्येण शिष्याः प्रतिपादिताः) ?

For the Text, dropped inadvertently, see Appendix I.

(5) The view that only *e* and *ai* be read with the code-letter *t*, and *o* and *au* without it, is now taken up here. The question which was asked and answered cursorily in (2) above, is now discussed again in a little bit detail.—(*App.* I, *l.* 1) कथमितरयोस्तपरत्वम् ? — इतरयोः = ओकारौकारयोः. The questioner naturally understands only the straightforward meaning of तपर, viz. ' what is followed by *t* '. अत्राद्यापि, in the portion of the *Mbh.* so far. The reply given is that the additional interpretation, viz. तादपि परस्तपरः is already fixed. If Pat. brings up the question under P. 1. 1. 1 : वृद्धिरादैच् (I. 42. 20–24), it is not to introduce any fresh question, but just to confirm (on the स्थूणानिखननन्याय) what is already taken as established. — स्थपतिवत् is not a clear parallel. — (*App.* I, *l.* 4) तस्मात् प्रतिज्ञा ··· तपरे इति. This concludes the lengthy discussion on सर्वाणि तपराणि versus एकारैकारावेव तपरौ. The idea is that this is only a verbal problem, if not a pseudo one. There is no problem either about the *tapara* status of the diphthongs or about the designation *it* for *t*, whether one reads *t* after all the four diphthongs or after *e* and *ai* only.

(6) (*App.* I, *ll.* 6–10) The last point in this section is about what prevents *at* etc. in अतो भिस ऐस् (P. 7. 1. 9) etc. from being misunderstood as a *pratyāhāra* of *a* with *t* (say in *aut* which would result in wrong forms -- with *-ais* instead of *-bhis* — in *agnibhis* etc.). The reply is first given in the form of a counterquestion : What prevents the स्वरूपग्रहण of the selfsame अत् (which would again result in similar wrong forms with *-ais* instead of *-bhis* in *bhavadbhis* etc.) ? The solution : व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिः (cf. the *Pari.* 1) is to be resorted to in all such cases. (Once you understand *at* itself from *at* by स्वरूपग्रहण, this *at* will be further equivalent to what ends in *at* by P. 1. 1. 72 : येन विधिस्तदन्तस्य and so भवत् etc. will be understood from it.)

Readings : (1) (*p.* 17, *l.* 9) MS निवत्तिति, ALSW निव(Sw °र्व)र्तन्ते (for निवृत्तिस्ते). See Notes. — (2) (*p.* 17, *l.* 9) Sw असति (for सति). See Notes. — (3) (*p.* 17, *l.* 9) MSSw निर्वर्तकं. — (4) (*p.* 17, *l.* 10) After इदमुच्यते, the MS reads तपरोच्चारणकतानशूनि इति । अरणं कर्तव्यम्. AL read this as °रणं कृतं न श्रूयते इति उच्चारणं क°. Sw drops intervening letters and simply reads °रणं कर्तव्यम् (followed here). — (5) (*p.* 17, *l.* 11) MS तपराणि नवता प्राप्यंते, AL तपरतां प्रा°, °राणि

न च ता(नि) प्रा° (adopted here). AL तपराग्ि (for ऽतप°). — (6) (*p*. 17, *l*. 12) AL -फलप्रति-. — (7) (*p*. 17, *l*. 13) Sw मन्यते. — (8) (*p*. 17, *l*. 14) MS चान्वर्थे, AL चान्वर्थ्यं (for चान्वर्थं [त्वं] as in Sw). — (9) (*p*. 17, *l*. 18) MS प्रतिपद्यत, Sw पद्ये(या)ताम् (for °पद्येते as in AL). — (10) (*p*. 17, *l*. 19) MSSw यदिह (for यदीह as in AL). — (11) (*p*. 17, *l*. 20) MSSw च तकार (for ऽन्त्यस्त°). Although MS clearly reads च त°, the context requires [ऽ]न्त्यस्त°. न, the first word in the sentence, missing in the MS, is properly restored by the eds. — (12) (*p*. 17, *l*. 20) MS -संज्ञाया, AL Sw -संज्ञाया: (for -संज्ञया). — (13) (*p*. 17, *l*. 21) ALSw तकारस्य (for तप°). — (14) (*p*. 17, *l*. 21) इयं विकल्पेति, AL द्वित्वविकल्पे तिता, Sw इयं विकल्पेतेति. The meaning of the first five letters is not clear to me. For the last two (तिति), see Notes. — (15) (*p*. 17, *l*. 21) AL प्रत्याख्य- (for प्रत्यय-). — (16) (*p*. 17, *l*. 22) Sw दिव उत् (सू. ६. १. १३१). — (17) (*p*. 17, *l*. 24) MS सज्ञापार्थं is properly understood as संज्ञी कार्यं by the eds. – (18) (*p*. 17, *l*. 25) AL [अ]नन्यार्थत्वम्. — (19) (*p*. 17, *l*. 25) Sw उपयुक्तमस्तीति (for °युक्तम्। संज्ञिनि). — (20) (*p*. 17, *l*. 27) AL ठञादिषु ञकारो. — (21) (*p*. 18, *l*. 2) MSALSw अटिदेव and टित:. But this cannot be the orig. text. The context requires अतिदेव and तित: (our emendation). — (22) AL कार्यत्वं. — (23) MS °पाद्यानानुच्चारणा, AL °पाद्यानामुच्चारणं (text as in Sw). — (24) (*p*. 18, *l*. 4) MS Sw प्रतिपादयति, AL °दयेदिति. — (25) (*p*. 18, *ll*. 4–5) MS वस्यरूपे (for च स्व°). — (26) (*p*. 18, *l*. 7) MS तस्य तू(रू)पलक्षणं मन्ये, AL तत्स्वरूपलक्षणं मन्ये, Sw °लक्षणमन्त्य इति. — (27) ALSw correctly emend MS यद्येसिदिनेव to यद्येवमादि-रेव. — (28) (*p*. 18, *l*. 8) MSSw विमरत्यभाव. AL drop इति. — (29) (*p*. 18, *l*. 9) MSSw तथाणाअतपरा(?), AL °णो अत°. — (30) MS अन्यो (emended to अन्त्यो already in the MS).—(31) (*p*. 18, *l*. 10) MSSw अनन्यत्वात् (for अनन्त्य°). – (32) MSSw असत्यपि इत्° (for °त्यामित्° as in AL). — (33) MS °संज्ञायांमत°, Sw °ज्ञायामत° (for °ज्ञायां सत°). — (34) (*p*. 18, *l*. 11) त[द्य]था is my suggestion for तथा of the MS and the eds. — (35) MS आनये × ति, ALSw आनयेदिति (for आनयेति). — (36) MS °लक्षणपार, AL °णपरे, Sw °लक्षणं, पार (for °लक्षण-व्यापारे, my emendation). — (37) (*p*. 18, *l*. 12) MS शुक्ले वाससा अंतर्भवत, AL शुक्लं वाससि अंतर्भवति, Sw वाससा शुक्ल अन्तर्भवत (for शुक्लवाससो नान्तर्भवनम्, an emendation).—(38) MS ALSw अस्त्येव (for अस्ति। एवं).–(39) (*p*.18, *l*.13) MS अत: सवडुत्संज्ञायां, AL अत: सवर्णसं° Sw अत एव इत्सं° (for अथ वेत्सं°). See the Notes for this emendation. — (40) (*p*. 18, *l*. 14) MS समुदायाव- (for °दायावयव-). — (41) (*p*. 18, *l*. 15) MS स्तु(सु)तष् (for सुटष्). — (42) Sw समुदायस्योङ्. — (43) (*App*. I, *l*. 3) MSSw स्थपतवद्. — (44) (*App*. I, *l*. 4) MS वषप्येव, Sw च वप्येव(?) (for तदप्येव, uncertain). — (45) (*App*. I, *l*. 7) MS किं स्वि, AL किं च (for किं स्वित्).

[2. 2]

The *Vār*. प्लुत्यादिष्वज्विधि: points out another defect in the *tapara* view. A Pluta consists of three (or more) moras. It will not therefore have the status

of *ac*. Such being the case, on the *tapara* view, in the case of diphthongs status of *ac* can be assigned only to the diphthongs as they are actually read, i. e. those consisting of two moras. It will not be available for Pluta vowels (as they consist of more than two vowels). In these circumstances operations based on *ac* status, though desired, cannot be performed. For example, in *go3trāta* (Voc. sing.), optional reduplication of (the first) *t* sanctioned by P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च cannot be had since the preceding Pluta *o* can no longer be called an *ac*. Similarly the augment *ṅamuṭ* in *pratyaṅṅ Aitikāyana* etc. Read the *Mbh.* : प्लुत्यादिष्वजाश्रयो विधिर्न सिध्यति। गो३त्रात नौ४त्रात इत्यत्र 'अनचि च', अच उत्तरस्य यरो द्वे भवत इति द्विर्वचनं न प्राप्नोति। इह च प्रत्यङ्ङै३तिकायन, उदङ्ङौ४पगव इति 'अचि' इति ङमुण्न प्राप्नोति।

(*p.* 18, *l.* 17) अभ्युपगम्य प्लुतं ... प्रतिषेध उच्यते. Without explaining the *Vār*. and the *Mbh*. thereon (which, evidently, he thinks too simple to require an explanation) Bhar. observes that in framing this *Vār*. Kāt. has simply taken for granted that Pluta is possible. That Pluta is simply impossible on the *tapara* view will be shown in the next *Vār*. Similarly Kaiy. : प्लुतसंज्ञामभ्युपगम्याच्कार्याणि न सिध्यन्तीत्युच्यते.

यथाभ्युपगम्य ह्रस्वयलोपौ etc. gives a parallel for such a process. This refers to the *Vārttika*-s 3 and 4 on P. 3. 1. 27 : कण्ड्वादिभ्यो यक् which along with the relevant *Mbh*. read as : 'तत्र धातुविधितुक्प्रतिषेधः' (वा. ३)। तत्र धातुविधेस्तुकश्च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः स्यात्। कण्ड्वौ कण्ड्वः। 'अचि श्नुधातुभ्रुवां य्वोरियङुवङौ' (पा. ६. ४. ७७) इत्युवङादेशः प्रसज्येत। ... तुक् च प्रतिषेद्धव्यः। वल्गुः मन्तुरिति। 'ह्रस्वस्य पिति कृति तुक्' (पा. ६. १. ७१) प्राप्नोति। 'ह्रस्वयलोपौ च' (वा. ४)। ह्रस्वयलोपौ च वक्तव्यौ स्याताम्। वल्गुः मन्तुरिति।

The point at discussion is this : Kāt. says (*Vār*. 1) that *yak* taught by the Sū. under discussion should be declared to be optional. Otherwise, he fears that *yak* will be there permanently (*Vār*. 2). In reply to the query 'so what?', he reads the *Vārttika*-s 3 and 4. A stem ending in this *yak* is technically called a *dhātu* (P. 3. 1. 32 : सनाद्यन्ता धातवः). This being so *uvaṅ* will come in (P. 6. 4. 77) resulting in undesired forms like *कण्डुवौ, *कण्डुवः instead of कण्ड्वौ कण्ड्वः. So this *uvaṅ* operation, based on the designation *dhātu*, will have to be prohibited. Secondly, in the case of stems like *valgu*- and *mantu*- (derived from *valgu* etc. + *yak* + *kvip* with the deletion of *kvip* and *yak*), a suffixed augment *tuk* (= *t*) will force itself undesiredly. So that, too, will have to be prohibited.

Here an objection may be raised : In making the above two suggestions, Kāt. has taken it for granted that *y* of *yak* is going to be deleted. But that is not the case. There is no provision for deleting this *y*. (P. 6. 1. 66 : लोपो व्योर्वलि does not apply here, as there is no following *val*.) Since the *dhātu*

here ends in *y*, and not in *u*, there is no danger of *uvaṅ*. Secondly, the final of *valgu* etc. will be lengthened by P. 7. 4. 25 : अकृत्-सार्वधातुकयोर्दीर्घः. Since the stem will no longer end in a short vowel, there is no possibility of *tuk* whatsoever. (Besides the difficulty of the presence of *y* is also there.) There is no need of declaring the optionality of *yak*.

The *Vār*. 4 takes care of these points. Kāt. is fully aware that in the *Aṣṭ*. there is no provision for dropping of *y* of *yak* in this position. Also that there is not going to be a short vowel. But the deletion of *y* and the short vowel are a desideratum. If there is no provision for them in the *Aṣṭ*., it has to be made. That is what he exactly does in the *Vār*. 4 : ह्रस्वयलोपौ च.

The only similarity in the two *Vār*. texts is that in a sequence of two Vārttikas, the first takes for granted something (*abhyupagamya*), not mentioned so far, which is either confirmed in the following one (as under P. 3. 1. 27), or denied as here.

[2. 3]

This is *Dīp*. on the *Mbh*. under the *Vār*. प्लुतसंज्ञा च which is somehow missing here. This is why प्लुतसंज्ञा is not possible : A Pluta has to be extra long (of three moras in the minimum) by definition (P. 1. 2. 27 : ऊकालोऽज्-ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः). The diphthong actually read is *dīrgha* (i. e. of two moras), as being the normal one. So that alone can be included in the *Pratyāhāra ac* (and have the name *ac*). A diphthong of three moras (i. e. a Pluta) cannot be called *ac*. It cannot also invoke P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः, for the suffixed *t* gives occasion to P. 1. 1. 70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य which precludes understanding of a three-mora diphthong by a two-mora one. So *ac* status for a three-mora vowel is ruled out. And, as P. 1. 2. 27 : ऊकालोऽज् ह्रस्व° says, *ac* status is a basic qualification for the name Pluta. So the *taparakaraṇa* is a bar in the case of the term Pluta. Read Kaiy. : प्लुत एव न प्राप्नोतीति दर्शयितुमाह — प्लुतसंज्ञा चेति। त्रिमात्रस्याचः प्लुतसंज्ञा विधीयते, तपरत्वे च त्रिमात्रस्याग्रहणादच्त्वाभावः।

The MS reading तमपारणाद्यम° (*p*. 18, *l*. 20) is corrupt. AL emend it to ततः अवधारणात् अच्त्वम°. Of this latter, अच्त्वम् is undoubtedly the original reading, though the rest does not make a sense. I think the whole reading was तदग्रहणादच्त्वम° (Cf. Kaiy.).

(*p*. 18, *l*. 21) तत्र यः प्लुतोऽस्ति ... त्रिमात्रः श्रूयेत. The *Dīp*. here makes the position of grammar still clearer. The grammar does not deny the coming in of a three-mora vowel altogether. Only the three-mora diphthong cannot come in. As to which three-mora vowel will actually come in depends upon the original diphthong ; it will be *ī*3 in the case of *e* and *ai*, and *ū*3 in the case of

o and *au* as they are nearest to the original. There is another clarification. In such an eventuality, there is no bar to reduplication (**gū3ttrāta* !). The awkward position is that a three-mora *ū*3 will materialize. (The substantive of त्रिमात्रः is इकारः उकारो वा, understood.) Similarly Kaiy. : तत्रैचां प्लुतौ विधीयमान इकारोकाराभ्यां गृहीत ईकार ऊकारश्च स्यात्.

[3]

The *Mbh.* now takes up the other view (सन्तु तह्यतपराणि) for discussion. *Vār.* 4 : अतपर एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे opens the attack. On this *Vār.* the *Mbh.* runs thus : यद्यतपराणि 'एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे' इति वक्तव्यम्। किं प्रयोजनम् ? एचो ह्रस्वादेशशासनेषु अर्ध एकारः, अर्ध ओकारो वा मा भूदिति । The *Vār.* says that Pāṇini had to frame the rule एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे (1. 1. 48) because he reads the diphthongs without *t*. If he had read them with *t*, he could dispense with this rule. The *Mbh.* brings out the significance of the *Vār.* thus : Whenever a short substitute is taught for *e*, *ai*, *o* and *au* (एचो ह्रस्वादेशशासनेषु), short *e* and *o* (*ĕ*, *ŏ*; that is *e* and *o* having one mora each) will press their claim as the most qualified substitute since they are short and they can also be comprehended by *e* and *o*. But they are not desired; *i* and *u* are desired. So to rule out the undesired substitutes and to make way for the desired ones, Pāṇini had to frame the rule एच इग्... If, on the other hand, he had read the diphthongs with *t*, he could get rid of the superfluous rule ; एच इग् ..., because, in that case, the name *ec* would have been restricted to two-mora diphthongs (as read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya). Consequently only two-mora diphthongs could have the name *ac*. Half *e* and *o*, being excluded from the status of *e*, and *o*, would not be *ac* in that case. But to be an *ac* is a basic qualification for being 'short' etc. (Cf. ऊकालोज् ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः, P. 1. 2. 27). Half *e* and *o* being thus automatically ruled out, Pāṇini could dispense with एच इग् .... (तपरत्वे पुनः सति ... ह्रस्वसंज्ञाया अभावः as the *Dīp.* says). Cf. also Kaiy. : असति हि तपरत्वे एकार-ओकाराभ्यां मात्रिकयोरर्धएकार-अर्ध-ओकारयोर्ग्रहणाद् अच्त्वाद् ध्रस्वत्वाद् विधानं स्यादिति सूत्रं कर्तव्यम्। तपरत्वे तु तयोरग्रहणात् प्राप्त्यभावः ।

In the *Dīp.* (*p.* 18, *l.* 23) एकारस्य stands for ओकारस्य also.

(*p.* 18, *l.* 24) ननु च यस्यापि तपराणि. The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : ननु च यस्यापि तपराणि, तेनाप्येतद् वक्तव्यम्। इमावैचौ समाहारवर्णौ — मात्राऽवर्णस्य, मात्रेवर्णोवर्णयोः । तयोर्ह्रस्वादेशशासनेषु कदाचिदवर्णः स्यात्, कदाचिदिवर्णोवर्णौ। मा कदाचिदवर्णं भूदिति । Here the *ataparavādin* retorts by saying that even the *taparavādin* has no escape from the rule एच इग् ... The *taparakaraṇa* may solve the problem in the case of *e* and *o*, but the case of *ai* and *au* is different. They are composite phonemes (समाहारवर्णौ) where the components *a* + *i*/*u* are clearly discernible (विश्लिष्टावर्णौ). So, even after *ĕ* and *ŏ*

are warded off, *a* still remains as a competitor. It is both *ac* and also short (*hrasva*). So *a* could equally come in, optionally, as a short substitute for *ai* and *au*, which is not desired. So, to ward it off, the Sū. एच इग् ... will still be necessary (योगारम्भं प्रति साम्यम्). Only there is a minor change : Instead of *eca*, one will now say *aica* (*ऐच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे). (As substitute for *e* and *o*, the short *e* and *o* are already excluded by the *taparakaraṇa*, so automatically *i/u* alone would come in, even in the absence of a specific rule to that effect.) So also Kaiy. : सूत्रारम्भं प्रति न कश्चिद्विशेष इत्यर्थः। अतपरत्वे 'एचः' इति वक्तव्यम्, तपरत्वे तु 'ऐचः' इति।

(*p.* 18, *l.* 26) ऐचोस्तु विश्लिष्टावर्णत्वात् ... न भवतः इति। Here Bhar. says that ĕ and ŏ, where *a* as a first component has completely coalesced (संश्लिष्ट), cannot come in as short substitutes for *ai* and *au* respectively, in which *a* is not so coalesced, and is separately discernible. Similarly Kaiy. : ऐचोर्विश्लिष्टावर्णत्वात् संश्लिष्टावर्णावर्ध-एकार — अर्ध-ओकारौ न भवतः. But where is the necessity of this argument ? ĕ and ŏ are already excluded by depriving them of *ac*- status and consequently of *hrasva*- status. How can they sneak in, to prevent which this argument based on *viśliṣṭāvarṇa* and *saṁśliṣṭāvarṇa* would be necessary ? The observations of Nāg. are worth reading. He says : विश्लिष्टेति। उपलभ्यमानेत्यर्थः। संश्लिष्टेति। स्पष्टमनुपलभ्यमानेत्यर्थः। अर्ध-एङोस्तु तपरनिर्देशेऽनच्त्वात् ह्रस्वत्वमेव नेति भावः। एङो शुद्धतालव्यमेवेति न तयोः स्थानेऽवर्णप्राप्तिरिति तत्त्वम्। After this he adds : 'संश्लिष्टावर्णौ' इति कैयटस्याप्यत्रैव तात्पर्यम्, which is not clear to me. For, while Nāg. himself is saying that *e* and *o* being purely palatal (and labial respectively), *a* cannot come in as their substitute, what Kaiy. (following Bhar.) is saying is that ĕ and ŏ which are *saṁśliṣṭāvarṇa* cannot come in as substitutes of *ai* and *au* which are *viśliṣṭāvarṇa*. Are these not two different things altogether ? Or, are we to understand, against the context, that this is said on the *tapara* view, with something like मम तु 'as for me (the *ataparavadin*)' as the introductory phrase to be understood ?

(*p.* 18, *l.* 27) प्रत्याख्यायते [ए]तद् ... भूयस्त्वादिति। Reply by the *taparavādin*. Here is a reference to the *Vār*. 4 : ऐचोश्चो° on P. 1. 1. 48 : एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे where Kāt. and Pat. discuss thoroughly the question of the necessity or otherwise of the rule एच इग् ... The *Mbh*. on that *Vār*. reads as : ऐचोश्चोत्तरभूयस्त्वाद्-वर्णो न भविष्यति। भूयसी मात्रेवर्णोवर्णयोरल्पीयस्यवर्णस्य। भूयस एव ग्रहणानि भविष्यन्ति। तद्यथा ब्राह्मणग्राम आनीयतामित्युच्यते, तत्र चावरतः पञ्चकारुकी भवति (I. 118. 2–4). According to this *Mbh*. the second constituent of *ai* and *au* (viz. *i/u*) has a larger duration than *a*, the first constituent. (This view contradicts another view, mentioned in the *Mbh*. quoted above, that both *a* and *i/u* have an equal duration of one mora). The *Dīp*. elaborates on the *Mbh*. statement by saying that, according to this view *a* has $\frac{1}{2}$ mora, while *i/u* have $1\frac{1}{2}$ each, thus making the

total of 2 moras of *ai*/*au*. Since it is always the dominant part or the majority that decides, the short substitute of *ai* and *au* will always be *i*/*u*, not *a*. The *taparavādin* refers to this discussion in the *Mbh.* on P. 1. 1. 48 *Vār.* 4 and says that the *ataparavādin* is wrong; he (the *taparvādin*) will not have to read the rule P. 1. 1. 48 (in the modified form) : *aica ig* ... etc. as a result of the *t*-suffixion.

The example of ब्राह्मणग्राम (meaning 'a village of the Brāhmaṇas', so called although there may be some people of other castes also) in the *Dīp.* is directly taken from the *Mbh.* on P. 1. 1. 48 as will be seen from the extract of the *Mbh.* quoted above. The other example, सालवनम् 'a sāl forest' (so called although there may be a few other trees also), is *Dīp*'s addition. Kaiy. has only मल्लग्राम as the example. Read : अर्धमात्रा अवर्णस्य अध्यर्धमात्रा इवर्णोवर्णयोः, भूयसा च व्यपदेशो मल्लग्रामवदितीकारोकारावेव भविष्यतः.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 3) इदमपि प्रत्याख्यायते 'सिद्धमेङः सस्थानत्वात्' इति। The *ataparavādin* here accuses the *taparavādin* of telling only a half truth. He refers only to the rejection, in the *Mbh.* under P. 1. 1. 48, of that rule as far as *ai* and *au* are concerned, on the basis of उत्तरभूयस्त्व. But he is concealing the rejection of that rule also for *e* and *o* on the ground of सस्थानत्व — thus making the *taparakaraṇa* superflous. Under P. 1. 1. 48 : एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे the *Vār.* 1 : एच इक् सवर्णाकारनिवृत्त्यर्थम् pleads for this Sū. saying that it is necessary for excluding ĕ and ŏ as substitutes of *e* and *o*, and for excluding *a* as the substitute of *ai* and *au*. Of the two purposes, the अकारनिवृत्ति purpose is refuted in the *Vār.* 4 (ऐचोश्चोत्तरभूयस्त्वात्) as we saw above. The other purpose is refuted in the *Vār.* 3 : सिद्धमेङः सस्थानत्वात्. The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* : सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्। एङः सस्थानत्वादिकारोकारौ भविष्यतोऽर्धएकारोऽर्धओकारो वा न भविष्यति। The *ataparavādin* argues that it is shown there (and will be also shown here) that ĕ and ŏ simply do not exist in the language. So *i* and *u* alone will come in as short substitutes of *e* and *o*. The *taparavādin* should not have concealed this.

After this there is a passage which is almost identical, which occurs both under P. 1. 1. 48 and also here (under '*eoṅ*/*aiauc*'). Whereas the purport of this passage under P. 1. 1. 48 is to show that that rule is superflous for the purpose of excluding undesired substitutes of *e* and *o*, here it is to show that *taparakaraṇa* is superflous as far as the same purpose is concerned. The passage runs as : ननु चैङः सस्थानतरावर्ध-एकारार्ध-ओकारौ। न तौ स्तः। यदि हि तौ स्यातां तावेवायमुपदिशेत्। ननु च भोश्छन्दोगानां सात्यमुग्रिराणायनीया अर्धमेकारमर्धमोकारं च अधीयते। सुजाते ए अश्वसूनृते। अध्वर्यो ओ अद्रिभिः सुतम्। शुक्रं ते ए अन्यद्यजतं ते ए अन्यदिति। It is worth noting that neither Kāt. not Pat. mentions, under P. 1. 1. 48, *taparakaraṇa* as a possible alternative to P. 1. 1. 48.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 4) न स्त एव ... ओष्ठ्य इति. ĕ/ŏ do not exist (a reflex of the *Mbh.* तौ न स्तः). Naturally only *i* (palatal) and *u* (labial) remain which there-

fore replace *e* (palatal) and *o* (labial) respectively on the strength of the common place of articulation. तालव्यस्य = एकारस्य । तालव्यः = इकारः । ओष्ठ्यस्य = ओकारस्य । ओष्ठ्यः = उकारः; scil. यथासंख्यमादेशः. Cf. Kaiy. (under P. 1. 1. 48) : एकारस्य तालव्यस्य तालव्य इकारः, ओकारस्य चौष्ठ्यस्यौष्ठ्य उकारो भविष्यति.

The *Dīp.* एवं शिक्षाकाराः ... यथा चयशानाम् (*p.* 19, *ll.* 6–13) discusses the two views : (1) *e*/*ai* are purely palatal and *o*/*au* purely labial, and (2) the place of articulation of *e*/*ai* is कण्ठतालु, and of *o*/*au* कण्ठोष्ठ. The first is the view of some Prātiśākhyas (cf. इचशेयास्तालौ and उवोपोपध्मा ओष्ठे [*Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya* I. 66, 70]), the second usually followed in the Pāṇinian school. The *Dīp.* एवं शिक्षाकाराः ... तालव्यौ refers to the first view. (But see below !) — कथं तालव्यत्वे सति ... (line 7) raises a problem. If *e*/*ai* are equally palatal as *i*, what causes the auditory difference between the two ? Also between *o*/*au* and *u* ? Incidentally, a word इकारात् is understood after ऐकारस्य च, and उकारात् after औकारस्य च. Their absence is confusing. The text as it is leads to a misunderstanding that the author is speaking of auditory difference between *e* and *ai*, and also between *o* and *au*. A specific mention of इकारात् and उकारात्, which are evidently meant, was necessary.

दर्शनभेदाददोषः (line 9) is the reply. This ' different view ' consists in this : According to those who believe that *e* / *o* are purely palatal and labial respectively, *e* is produced at the palate only (स्थानं तात्वेव), and *o* at the lips only (ओष्ठावेव स्थानमोकारस्य). But what happens is that the outgoing breath, while producing *e* at the palate, just touches, in passing, that part of velum which is near to the palate (स्वसमीपे यः कण्ठस्तमुपश्लेषयति) ; it similarly touches that part of the velum which is near to the lips in producing *o* (वायुः कण्ठमभिहन्ति). This incidental and secondary contact of breath with a part of the adjacent velum in the utterance of *e* / *o* is responsible for the श्रुतिभेद् between *e* / *o* and *i* / *u* respectively, although *e* is as purely palatal as *i*, and *o* as purely labial as *u*.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 12) इतरे तदपि ... यथा चयशानाम् . This is either another explanation for श्रुतिभेद, advanced by some others, or the same as the one given above (see observation 1 below). Different parts of tongue — the *Dīp.* does not specifically say which — come in contact with the palate when *i* and *e* are uttered. (Similarly, it is to be presumed, different parts of tongue become active, i. e. are raised in the utterance of *u* and *o*.) A parallel is given of three kinds of palatal consonants, *c* (a stop), *y* (a semi-vovel) and *ś* (a sibilant). Although all are palatal, different parts of tongue come in contact with the palate in their utterance.

Observations : (1). The sentence इतरे तदपि स्थानमभिमन्यन्ते apparently refers to the view एदैतोः कण्ठतालु । ओदौतोः कण्ठोष्ठम् held in the Pāṇinian tradition (तदपि = कण्ठमपि). But if this is so this very fact itself would clearly account for

the श्रुतिभेद. Nothing further would be necessary. Then why does Bhar. introduce the point of different parts of the tongue being involved in the production of *i*, and in that of *e* ? If, alternatively, he is still speaking of *e* as being purely palatal, what could the sentence इतरे तदपि स्थानमभिन्यन्ते mean ? I confess, I cannot quite understand the text here.

Here is one solution (suggested by Pandit V. B. Bhagavat) : इतरे तदपि स्थानमभिमन्यन्ते is just a parenthetical remark. It is not to be connected with what follows. श्रुतिभेदो जिह्वाग्र° etc. simply continues the argument which was introduced with एके मन्यन्ते. Also, श्रुतिभेदो जिह्वाग्रमध्यमूलभेदात् is not any rival explanation of श्रुतिभेद. It is the same as the one given above, viz. वायु: ... स्वसमीपे य: कण्ठस्तमुपश्लेषयति ; only in a different form. (Or, alternatively, it is only a parallel, *dṛṣṭānta*, which does not apply to the *dārṣṭāntika*.)

(2) The word दर्शनभेदात् also now becomes vague. Apparently it refers to the two views about the point of articulation of *e* : (1) palatal (2) palato-velar (कण्ठतालु). But this does not seem to be probable for the reason given above. The word दर्शनभेदात् has therefore to be logically explained as giving two different explanations for the श्रुतिभेद *on the same view*, i. e. *e* is palatal. The two alternative explanations are, of course; (1) the breath's secondary contact with the velum, and (2) different parts of the tongue coming into contact with the palate. For a possible explanation that the two are actually one in different garbs, see above under (1).

(3) The text adopted is conjectural. For our emendation जिह्वाग्र° the MS actually reads श्रोत्राग्र° and for चयशानाम् it reads श्रयशानाम् . See below under *Readings*.

(*p*. 19, *l*. 13) ननु चैङ: ... तावेव सस्थानतरौ । For the full text of the *Mbh*., see above (*p*. 192, *ll*. 33–35). The point made by the advocate of *taparakaraṇa* is that on the principle of सस्थानत्व adduced by the opponent, *ĕ* and *ŏ* will be more homogenious (सस्थानतर) than *i* and *u* with *e* and *o* resp. The initial *a*- element in *ĕ* and *ŏ*, although *saṁśliṣṭa*, entitles them to be closer than *i* (without an *a*- element) to *e* and *o*. It must be stated that the *Dīp*. sentence एवं विद्यते । विद्यमानत्वम् etc. is not quite clear. It seems to be corrupt. Its tenor seems to be that the argument based on homogeneity would be correct *if ĕ* and *ŏ* existed. But they do not (न तौ स्त:). Half *e* and *o* are most economic and so they themselves would have been read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya if they existed (विद्यमानौ). They could comprehend, by the usual rule (P. 1. 1. 69) long and pluta *e* / *o* also (ताभ्यामुपदिष्टाभ्यां दीर्घप्लुतयोरपि ग्रहणं सिध्यतीति भाव: as Kaiy. says).

(*p*. 19, *l*. 15) ननु गुणवृद्धिसंज्ञार्थमुपदेश: स्यात् . The *taparavādin* argues that the reading of *e* and *o* instead of *ĕ* and *ŏ* does not necessarily prove the non-existence of the latter. *ĕ* and *ŏ* exist. Still ignoring them the Sūtrakāra read

e and *o* because that is convenient for the terms Guṇa and Vṛddhi which denote *e*, *o* and *ai au* which consist of two moras. This argument is refuted by the *ataparavādin* saying that this is not a convincing argument. The necessity of reading two-mora *e* and *o* is only in the *saṁjñā*- rules (दीर्घग्रहणं संज्ञायां करिष्यते). संज्ञायां = संज्ञाविधौ = संज्ञाविधायके शास्त्रे.

The next sentence तथा च सति ··· कर्तव्यं भवति (lines 16–17) is not quite clear, though the MS. does not seem to be corrupt here. The rule सहिवहोरोद-वर्णस्य (P. 6. 3. 112) teaches that *a* of *sah*- and *vah*- is replaced by *o* when their *ḍh* (< *h*) is dropped before a following *ḍh*, e. g. *soḍhum*, *voḍhum* etc. Here it is usually explained that *avarṇasya* in the rule is for preventing *u* (*u*° < *ua*°- < *va*°) of *vah*- being replaced by *o* (say in *ūḍhaḥ* 'carried'). As to the question, why Pāṇini did not simply say अस्य instead of the lengthy अवर्णस्य, it is said that owing to the preceding *t* (*od* < *ot*), *a* in *asya* would have meant a short *a* only, excluding *ā*. This being the case, in forms like *udavoḍhām* (Aor. 3. du. active fr. *ud* + *vah*), where the root is said to undergo Vṛddhi,[1] *ā* could not be replaced by *o*, thus resulting into a wrong form. Read : अवर्णस्येति किम् ? ऊढः, ऊढवान् । वर्णग्रहणं किम् ? कृतायामपि वृद्धौ यथा स्यात् — उदवोढाम् उदवोढम् । तादपि परस्तपरः तपरत्वादाकारस्य ग्रहणं न स्यात् (काशिका). But why *taparakaraṇa*- itself (तपरकरणं किम्) ? — that question does not seem to have been asked.

To return to our *Dīp*. Bhar. evidently connects the *taparakaraṇa* and the reading of the word *varṇa*- with the Akṣarasamāmnāya which reads *e* / *o* and not *ĕ* / *ŏ*. तथा सति means 'since *e* / *o* have been read instead of *ĕ* / *ŏ*'. This is the idea : The purpose of reading *t* (in *ot*) is to exclude Pluta. If Pāṇini had read *ĕ* / *ŏ* in the Akṣaras. then two-mora *e* / *o* would not be included in *aṇ*. Since they would not be *aṇ*, they would not comprehend their homogeneous phonemes. So *o* in P. 6. 3. 112 also would not comprehend the undesired pluta *o*. So there would not have been a necessity to use *t* to preclude it. The *taparakaraṇa* in *ot* is necessary because a two-mora *o* is *aṇ* as it is so read in the Akṣarasa.

I am not quite sure of this interpretation ; it almost looks like a blemish viz. *gaurava*, pointed out by the *taparavādin* in the view of the *ataparavādin*. A reply was expected but it does not follow.

(*p*. 19, *l*. 18) ननु च भोश्छन्दोगानां सात्यमुग्रि ... छन्दोगानामिति. The last argument by the *taparavādin* and a reply to it. The argument consists in challenging the statement of the *ataparavādin* : न तौ स्तः. Short *e* and *o* *are* there. They are heard in the Vedic recitation of the Sātyamugri and the Rāṇāyanīya schools of the Sāmavedins. The *Mbh.* cites three examples of *ĕ*

1. ढत्वादेरसिद्धत्वात् ततः पूर्वं 'वदव्रज' इत्यादिना वृद्धिः । (न्यास).

and one of ŏ out of which the *Dīp.* quotes only one viz. सुजाते अश्वसूनृते[1] (*RV.* 5. 79. 1 etc., *SV* 1. 421e, 1090e–1092e). The *Dīp.* quotes the contents of some Sāmaveda work on phonetics, saying that those Sāmavedins lay down that an *a*, unless followed by *v* or *y*, is changed to ĕ when it follows, within the same *pāda*, a preceding *e* or *o* : अन्तःपादमव्यपरस्यैव एकारमादेशं विदधति. This passage, however, seems to be corrupt as it misses the words अकारस्य, ओकारं and also अर्धम्. The *Prad.* is more authentic : अन्तःपादस्थस्याव्यपरस्याकारस्यार्धमेकार-मर्धमोकारं च विदधति (curiously the subject is missing here also).

Outside these two Sāmaveda schools this practice of *a* > ĕ / ŏ is not followed. The *ṚV.* e. g. keeps in this position the two vowels *e* / *o* and *a* apart. *a* neither coalesces in the preceding *e* / *o*, nor is it modified in any other way. Cf. P. 6. 1. 115 : नान्तःपा(Kāś. प्रकृत्यान्तःपा)दमव्यपरे, under which the same examples, सुजाते अश्वसूनृते etc. occur in the *Mbh.* The Sāmavedins mentioned above, however, seem to have converted the following *a* into ĕ or ŏ (as the case may be), under the influence of assimilation, keeping, at the same time, the quantity intact.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 20) पार्षदकृतिरेषा .... छन्दोगानामिति. This passage refuses to recognize this practice as sufficient for making a grammatical provision. It is peculiar to a particular school, and not a universal one. The *taparavādin* makes a feeble attempt at protest : Pāṇini notes in 7. 4. 38 : देवसुम्नयोर्यजुषि काठके the practice of lengthening the final *a* of *deva-* and *sumna-* under certain circumstances in a prose formula of the Kāṭhaka. True, but that is a different case. The short *e* and *o* under discussion are only musical sounds (गीतिवशात् तथोच्चारणम् as Kaiy. says more expressly), and not speech sounds. There are many others, peculiar to the Sāmavedins, like कितकिटा (?). The grammar is not bound to take note of them.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 18, *l.* 17) MS द्विवचनादयो. — (2) (*p.* 18, *l.* 18) °विधिस्तुक्°. — (3) (*p.* 18, *l.* 19) The *pratīka* प्लुतसंज्ञा चेति is evidently missing in the MS. — (4) (*p.* 18, *l.* 20) MS तमपा(or या)रणाद्यम°, AL ततः अवधारणात् अच्त्वम°, Sw तमयारणा(?) च्त्वम°. The emendation अच्त्वम° of the eds. is certainly happy, but the earlier part still remains obscure. — (5) (*p.* 18, *l.* 21) MS Sw ई(MS इ)कार ऊकारश्च. — (6) (*p.* 18, *l.* 22) MS गौत्रेत्रादिषु, Sw गोत्रेत्या°. — (7) (*p.* 18, *l.* 23) MS सत्यध्वव (or °च) (for °धंस्य). — (8) (*p.* 18, *l.* 25) MS एव इत्युं. — (9) (*p.* 19, *l.* 2) AL प्रविभागः. — (10) MS व्राह्मग्रामस्तानवन°, AL ब्राह्मण-ग्रामस्यानयन° (for °मः सालवन° as in Sw). — (11) (*p.* 19, *l.* 7) AL °दर्शने न. —

1. This is how the MS writes; eds. एश्व° (so also Nirṇayasāgara and Jhajjhar eds. of the *Mbh.*). Kielhorn सुजाते ए अश्व°; Mm. Abhyankar (Mar. ed.) °ते एँ अश्व°. Nāg. remarks : सुजाते ए अश्व° इत्यकारलेखस्तु प्रामादिकः.

(12) (*p*. 19, *l*. 9) MS Sw °प्रयत्नका:. — (13) Following the MS, eds. read सर्वे अभिन्ना इति दर्शनभेदाददोष: as one sentence. But this seems erroneous. स्थानप्रयत्नादिका: सर्वे अभिन्ना: is mentioned as going against the श्रुतिभेद and so form one sentence —one question (ending with अभिन्ना इति). दर्शनभेदाद् (explained in the following) अदोष: forms the reply, and hence is an independent sentence. — (14) MSAL एके न म°. — (15) (*p*. 19, *l*. 10) MS निवृत्तौ. — (16) MS स्वरसमाये; AL स्वरसमाम्नाये, Sw स्वरसमीपे. — (17) (*p*. 19, *l*. 12) MS °भेदो श्रो°, AL °भेद: श्रो°, Sw °भेदोऽ(पि) श्रो°. Though the MS clearly writes °भेदोश्रो°, भेदो is ungrammatical before *ś*°. So AL emend it to भेद:, while Sw thinks that ऽपि after it may have been lost. Still श्रोत्र is unaccountable. No such parts as अग्र, मध्य and मूल of श्रोत्र are known. On the other hand they go with जिह्वा. जिह्वाग्र etc. are well known. There is a difference in the sound produced according as the tip or the blade or some other part comes into contact with the point of articulation. (ध्वनिभेद causes श्रुतिभेद.) Hence the emendation जिह्वाग्र°. — (18) (*p*. 19, *l*. 13) MS Sw °श्रयशानां°, AL °श्रयस्थानाम् (for चयशानाम्). श्रयशानां makes no sense. [आ]श्रयस्थानाम्, though a normal Sanskrit word, is of little use here. So I simply emend श्र to च which gives us three palatal consonants (च्, य्, श्) as examples of श्रुतिभेद caused by जिह्वाग्र etc. — (19) (*p*. 19, *l*. 15) After प्रत्याहारे, the MS repeats एवं विद्यते, after which it reads वद्यमा. I think AL are right in reconstructing विद्यमानौ out of this वद्यमा. This विद्यमानौ is a paraphrase of the *Mbh*. यदि हि तौ स्याताम्. In fact the whole *Dīp*. sentence: लाघवात् प्रत्याहारे विद्यमानौ तावेव पठितौ स्याताम् (the straight forward construction would rather have been: विद्यमानौ तावेव लाघवात् प्रत्या° etc.) is a paraphrase of the *Mbh*. यदि हि तौ स्याताम्, तावेवायमुपदिशेत्. — (20) MS °संज्ञाज, Sw संज्ञा ज (for °संज्ञार्थं as emended in AL.). — (21) (*p*. 19, *l*. 19) For the reading अश्व°, see Notes. — (22) (*p*. 19, *l*. 20) MS प्रतिशाख्यं ते; Sw प्रातिशाख्यान्ते. — (23) (*p*. 19, *l*. 22) MS पार्षदप्रकृति°. AL drop एतदुक्तं भवति. — (24) (*p*. 19, *ll*. 22–23) MS स्वस्थामेव, Sw स्वस्था(न)मेव (for स्वस्थाने च as in AL).

[3. 1]

आन्तर्यतस्त्रिमात्र ... etc. This is the *Bhāṣya* on the next *Vār*.: एकादेशे दीर्घग्रहणम् (not quoted in the *Dīp*.). The *Mbh*. runs thus: 'एकादेशे दीर्घग्रहणम्' (वा. ५)। एकादेशे दीर्घग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। 'आद् गुणो (पा. ६. १. ८७), दीर्घः', 'वृद्धिरेचि (८८), दीर्घः' इति। किं प्रयोजनम्? आन्तर्यतस्त्रिमात्रचतुर्मात्राणां स्थानिनां त्रिमात्रचतुर्मात्रा आदेशा मा भूवन्निति। खट्वा इन्द्रः खट्वेन्द्रः, खट्वा उदकं खट्वोदकम् ...। The *Vār*. argues that, if *taparakaraṇa* is not there, then *e*, e. g., (which is conveyed by *eṅ* which is named as Guṇa P. 1. 1. 2) can represent *e* of any duration, even that of 3 or 4 moras. Also, a substitute has to come as near to the original as possible (P. 1. 1. 50 : स्थानेऽन्तरतमः). Under these circumstances, when a single substitute like Guṇa (P. 6. 1. 87) or Vṛddhi (88) is

taught, it will have to be — where possible— of that duration which is the total duration of the two original vowels (taken together) which coalesce. If the total duration of the two original vowels is 3 moras, the Guṇa vowel *e* (in *khaṭvā + indraḥ*) will have to be of three moras (called Pluta), and if 4 moras (*khaṭvā + odanaḥ*), the Vṛddhi substitute *au* will have to be of 4 moras. But this is undesired. To prevent the production of such wrong forms, the word *dīrgha* 'a long vowel' (i. e. of 2 moras) will have to be specifically added in the Sūtras which teach a single substitute. (Of course it is not necessary to actually read *dīrghaḥ* in each and every rule teaching a single substitute. An addition of it in just one Sū. viz. *ekaḥ pūrvaparayoḥ* [P. 6. 1. 84] suffices.) If diphthongs had been read with *t*, then *eṅ* would denote only *e* of two moras. In that case a Pluta *e* would not be understood by *eṅ*, and could not have the designation Guṇa. Since *taparakaraṇa* is not there, we must now read *dīrghaḥ*.

(*p*. 19, *l*. 25) अन्यस्याभावात्... विषये स्मृतः. The *taparavādin* anticipates an objection and replies it. The *ataparavādin* will perhaps say that the danger of a three-mora substitute is unreal. The Pluta is taught in definite situations (प्लुतश्च विषये स्मृतः), like calling from a distance etc. (P. 8. 2. 84). When the context of such a situation is not there, a Pluta cannot simply result mechanically (like $2+1=3$, or $2+2=4$). Since the danger of Pluta is not there, the addition of *dīrghaḥ* to prevent it is not necessary, even when *e*, *o* etc. are read without *t* in the Akṣarasa. To such an argument the *taparavādin* replies by saying that this argument is not sound. After all, in a situation like *khaṭvā + indraḥ*, a Guṇa substitute is taught. It has to take the place. Now there are three vowels called Guṇa : *a*, *e* and *o*. Of these *o* is ruled out because it is not similar in the matter of the place of articulation. Even *a* is ruled out for a similar reason. So only *e* remains. Since no other substitute is available (अन्यस्याभावात्), a three-mora *e* (as required by *āntarya*) has to come in, Pluta-situation or no such situation. To prevent it *taparakaraṇa* is necessary.

(*p*. 19, *l*. 26) इह तावत् पशुमिति etc. Bhar. skips over some part of the *Mbh*. here. The *ataparavādin*, while accepting the necessity of qualifying the single substitute by *dīrgha-*, does not think that an addition of that word is necessary. It is suggested that the rule अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः (P. 6. 1. 101) should be split into two : (1) अकः सवर्णे, and (2) दीर्घः. The object in separating दीर्घः is to bring it down in the subsequent rules which teach an *ekādeśa*. Thus on the force of continuation of *dīrghaḥ* all single substitutes will be automatically long. No *trimātra* or *caturmātra* substitute can gate-crash. When everything seems to be all right at this stage, a fresh objection is taken against qualifying the substitute by *dīrgha-* — whether by actually adding it in P. 6. 1. 84 or whether by continuing it from P. 6. 1. 101. The objection is that if every single substitute is made long, then

even a *pūrvarūpa* or a *pararūpa* saṁdhi will show a long substitute in, e. g. *paśum*, *viddham* and *pacanti*, which is not desired. They all actually have a short substitute. The *Mbh.* इह तावत् पशुमिति etc. quoted by Bhar. refutes this objection. The full text of the *Mbh.* is as follows : नैष दोषः । इह तावत् पशुमिति 'अम्येकः' इतीयता सिद्धम् । सोऽयमेवं सिद्धे सति यत् पूर्वग्रहणं करोति, तस्यैतत् प्रयोजनम् — यथाजातीयकः पूर्वस्तथाजातीयक उभयोर्यथा स्यादिति ।

This is the argument : Pāṇini reads his rule 6. 1. 107 as अमि पूर्वः. He could simply read it as अमि if he wanted a long single substitute. The word एकः is continued from P. 6. 1. 84 (एकः पूर्वपरयोः). We could also bring down the expression पूर्वसवर्णः from P. 6. 1. 102 : प्रथमयोः पूर्वसवर्णः, where *dīrghaḥ* is valid from अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः. So a one-word rule अमि would have sufficed. Still Pāṇini adds पूर्वः. Why ? To make it sure that the quantity of the vowel-substitute would be the same as that of the preceding stem-final. So even if the single substitute is qualified by *dīrgha* in a general way, it will be operative in Guṇa Saṁdhi etc. ; it will not affect the case of Pūrvarūpa before *am* (*paśu* + *am* = *paśum*). The *Dīp.* does not explain this passage although it has quoted the *pratīka*. According to this interpretation, सिद्धे in the *Mbh.* means दीर्घे सिद्धे. यथाजातीयकः = ह्रस्वो दीर्घो वा.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 27) एतदपि वा ... 'अम्येकः' इत्येतत् स्यात्. The *Dīp.* goes one better. It skips over the *Mbh.* इह तावत् पशुम् etc. The *Mbh.* says that the purpose of पूर्वः in 'अमि पूर्वः' is to indicate यथाजातीयकः पूर्वस्तथाजातीयक उभयोर्यथा स्यादिति. Otherwise the word पूर्वः is superfluous. The *Dīp.*, without commenting on this, goes further and says that, in a sense, even *ami* is superfluous (एतदपि वा न कर्तव्यम्). For, *if* Pāṇini wanted a long vowel here (**paśūm*), it could easily be available by P. 6. 1. 102 : प्रथमयोः पूर्वसवर्णः which applies to all the endings of Nom. and the Acc. (and where दीर्घः is continued from the previous [101] rule : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः). Why should a separate rule like *ami* be necessary at all ? Bhar. admits the force of the argument (सत्यम् । एवमेतत् ।). In the *Dīp.* किं त्वारभ्यमाणे etc. he points out a purpose of *ami*. The rule वा छन्दसि (P. 6. 1. 106) says that in the Veda a पूर्वसवर्णदीर्घ substitute may not optionally come in when *jas* (Nom. pl.) or a case-ending beginning with a vowel (except *a* or *ā*) follows a long stem vowel (so *mārutīḥ* and *mārutyaḥ*, Nom. pl.). This is also to be made applicable with reference to *am* of the Acc. sing. (so, e. g., both *śamīm* and *śamyam*). How could it be made so applicable unless one reads *ami* ? The *ārambha* (framing, reading) of *ami* after *vā chandasi* helps the *anuvṛtti* of *vā chandasi* into *ami*. Therefore, the word *pūrva-* 'preceding' is read for the sake of (preservation of) the form of the preceding. Similarly Kaiy. : 'प्रथमयोः ...' इति सिद्ध एतदपि किमर्थमुच्यते इति चेत्, 'वा छन्दसि' इत्य[स्या]नानुवृत्त्यर्थम् ।

(*p.* 20, *l.* 3) ननु च पूर्वकं ... 'पूर्वसवर्णः' इति. This passage is rather obscure and confusing. The MS reads द्वित्वमप्यनुवर्तते. द्वित्व, however, has nothing to do with the matter in hand. AL emend it to दीर्घम°. For the considerations of grammar, I have further emended it to दीर्घत्वम°. In the next sentence the MS clearly reads ननु but the consideration of context and coherent interpretation suggest that the older reading could be तत्र. Secondly, here पूर्वानुवृत्तिः, which should normally mean 'continuation of the word *pūrva*' (from P. 6. 1. 102, in this case), has to be interpreted as meaning 'reading of the word *pūrva*' (in P. 6. 1. 107), though this procedure is not very happy. But the real crux is the sentence तथापि द्वित्व(? दीर्घत्व)मप्यनुवर्तते। The previous sentence तस्मात् पूर्वग्रहणं etc. naturally marks the conclusion of one thought unit. After this, our sentence तथापि द्वित्व-(? दीर्घत्व)मपि etc. looks rather out of place, particularly if we keep ननु of the next sentence which marks the beginning of a new sentence, which is in the nature of an objection. I think that a small passage before our sentence was previously there but is now missing. I further think that that passage was of the nature of an enquiry. It sought to know why a fresh reading of *pūrva* in P. 6. 1. 107 was necessary when it was possible to continue *pūrva* — from P. 6. 1. 102. I tentatively reconstruct this passage as: ननु च पूर्वकं पूर्वग्रहणमनुवर्तते। सत्यम्। The word सत्यम् is necessary as denotative of partial admition and, therefore, justifying the word तथापि in the next sentence. This, then, is the whole idea: The sentence तस्मात् पूर्वग्रहणं etc. concludes that part of the *Dīp.* which says that *pūrva* stands for *pūrvarūpa* thus prohibiting any modification of the stem-final. The reconstructed sentence points out that although *pūrva* is necessary, there is already one *pūrva*. Why this new *pūrva* ? — That is the unexpressed question. The *Dīp.* सत्यम् accepts the force of the objection. The remaining *Dīp.* तत्र (our emendation of ननु) चैवमर्थां etc. explains the purpose of freshly reading (पूर्वानुवृत्तिः) the word *pūrva*.

The idea contained in पूर्वो दीर्घो ... मा भूत् is this: The word *pūrva* in P. 6. 1. 102 is associated with सवर्ण and दीर्घ (this latter continued from P. 6. 1. 101). If it had been made to continue in P. 6. 1. 102, it would have produced wrong forms. The word *savarṇa* would have required that the homogenious substitute should be as near both the originals taken together (उभयान्तरतमः) as possible. In a word like कुमारीम्, for example, a vowel ī of three moras would have to come in as a substitute. In cases like वृक्षम् a substitute of two moras would have to be brought in. To avoid such undesired forms a fresh *pūrva*, which is free from such associations, is introduced. पूर्वो दीर्घो यथा स्यात् means पूर्वः दीर्घ एव (i. e. द्विमात्रिकः) यथा स्यात्। The expression उभयान्तरतम ultimately means त्रिमात्रः etc. — The last sentence: इदमप्यत्रा° ··· etc. simply says, without any further elucidation, that along with *pūrva*- read here, *pūrva*- from P. 6. 1. 102 also be continued here. For this idea, see also below: संप्रसारणपूर्वत्वे द्वौ पूर्वशब्दावनुवर्तेते (*line* 9).

(*p.* 20, *l.* 6) अथ वाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति. The *Mbh.* now is discussing the second example, viz. *viddha*. Here also *pūrvarūpa* is involved and so the arguments made in connection with *paśum* also apply here (विद्धमिति । 'पूर्वः' इत्येवानुवर्तते ।).Then the *Mbh.* advances another argument alternatively, trying to show that inspite of the general injunction *dīrghaḥ*, the *pūrva* will manage to keep itself intact. The *Mbh.* runs thus : अथ वाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति — नानेन संप्रसारणदीर्घो भवतीति, यदयं हल उत्तरस्य संप्रसारणस्य दीर्घत्वं शास्ति ।

The word *viddha* is formed from *vyadh*+(*k*)*ta* with saṁprasāraṇa (*viadh*, P. 6. 1. 16) and *pūrvarūpa* (*vidh*, P. 6. 1. 108). The opponent has claimed that here also a general injunction *dīrghaḥ* will result in the wrong form **vīddha*. The advocate of *dīrgha*, having first repeated the argument made in connection with *paśum*, now mentions P. 6. 4. 2 : हलः as another proof. This rule lays down lengthening of a stem-final saṁprasāraṇized vowel if it follows a consonant, e. g. *hūta* 'called' from *hve*+*ta*. (Here *hve*>*hvā* [P. 6. 1. 45] > *huā* (6. 1. 15) > *hu* [P. 6. 1. 108] > *hū* [P. 6. 4. 2].) The advocate of *dīrgha* now says that if Pāṇini wanted every saṁprasāraṇized vowel to be long, it was not necessary for him to frame the rule हलः. The general injunction '*dīrghaḥ*' (which he has now proposed) would have sufficed. Still Pāṇini frames '*halaḥ*'. This shows that inspite of a general injunction of lengthening of single substitutes, still, as far as the lengthening of saṁprasāraṇized vowels is concerned, only in those cases the lengthening will take place, which satisfy the conditions mentioned in P. 6. 4. 2. As the saṁprasāraṇized vowel (*i*) is not stem-final in *viddha* there is no danger of an undesired lengthening there. The general injunction '*dīrghaḥ*' can stand, without damage to the desired form in *viddha*.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 6) ननु च नियमार्थम् ... उत इति । This *Dīp.* takes an objection to the above argument of the *Mbh.* The *dīrghavādin* has taken '*halaḥ*' as an injunction (*vidhi*). He thus implies that lengthening of saṁprasāraṇized vowels (including *viddha*) has not otherwise become due. But he may be mistaken. P. 6. 4. 2 : हलः may be a restrictive rule (*niyama*), not an injunction (*vidhi*). To explain : The general injunction '*dīrghaḥ*' applies even in the case of saṁprasāraṇa. To the natural question viz. 'why then the special rule '*halaḥ*' ?' the reply is : it is for restriction (नियमार्थम्)[1]. The restriction can be thus stated : 'दीर्घः' इत्यनेन यदि संप्रसारणस्य दीर्घः स्यात्, तर्हि हल उत्तरं यत् संप्रसारणं तदन्तस्यैव अङ्गस्य स्यात्, नान्यस्य 'If there is to be a lengthening of the saṁprasāraṇized vowel by the injunction '*dīrghaḥ*', then only that saṁprasāraṇized vowel which is a stem-final and which follows a consonant (which is a part of the stem) is lengthened; not any other'. The purpose of this restriction is to exclude cases

1. Cf. the maxim : सिद्धे सति पुनर्ग्रहणं नियमार्थम् ।

like *uta* (from *ve* 'weave') where there is no lengthening since *u* ($<$ *v*) does not follow a consonant. Thus the opponent of *dīrghagrahaṇa* argues that the rule *halaḥ* is no guarantee against the injunction *dīrghaḥ* applying to *viddha*. The short *i* is still open to danger. *Dīrghagrahaṇa* cannot be accepted.

Observation: No attempt is made in the *Dīp*. to give a reply to this argument of the opponent of *dīrghagrahaṇa*. The *Dīp*. simply advances another *jñāpaka*: 'इदं तर्हि ज्ञापकं ... संप्रसारणस्य ' इति. But Kaiy. takes up the argument on behelf of the *dīrghagrahaṇavādin* and says that the rule '*halaḥ*' cannot be looked upon as a restriction, as it violates a principle viz. that when a rule can be looked upon either as a *vidhi* or as a *niyama*, preference is given to its understanding as a *vidhi*. Read: विधिनियमसंभवे विधिरेव बलीयान्' इति विधेर्बलीयस्त्वान्नियमो न भवति — हलः [परस्य] एव दीर्घत्वं यथा स्याद्, उत इत्यादौ मा भूदिति ।

(*p*. 20, *l*. 7) इदं तर्हि ज्ञापकम् ··· 'संप्रसारणस्य' इति। Another clue (*jñāpaka*), indicating नानेन (= दीर्घग्रहणेन) संप्रसारणस्य दीर्घो भवति. P. 6. 3. 139 : संप्रसारणस्य lays down a long substitute for the final samprasāraṇized vowel of the first constituent of a compound. Thus (कौमुदगन्धिपतिः becomes) कौमुदगन्धीपतिः 'husband of a daughter of Kumudagandhi'. The *prakriyā* here is as follows:

1. The compound कुमुदगन्धि (lit. meaning 'having the sweet perfume of a white lotus') is first formed from कुमुद + गन्ध (कुमुदस्येव गन्धोऽस्य) with the stem-final *i* (thus *-gandha* $>$ *-gandhi*) by P. 5. 4. 137 : उपमानाच्च.

2. कुमुदगन्धेरपत्यं स्त्री कौमुदगन्ध्या. The patronymic suffix *aṇ* by P. 4. 1. 92 : तस्यापत्यम्; this *aṇ* is replaced, in fem., by *ṣyaṅ* by P. 4. 1. 78 : अणिञोरनार्षयोर्गुरूपोत्तमयोः ष्यङ् गोत्रे; the nominal stem thus formed finally gets the fem. suffix *cāp* by P. 4. 1. 74 : यङश्चाप्, resulting in the form कौमुदगन्ध्या.

3. कौमुदगन्ध्यायाः पतिः [कौमुदगन्धीपतिः]. When कौमुदगन्ध्या is compounded with पति (as a षष्ठी-तत्पुरुष), there is a Saṁprasāraṇa of *ṣyaṅ* by P. 6. 1. 13 : ष्यङः संप्रसारणं पुत्रपत्योस्तत्पुरुषे, yielding the form °गन्धि°.

4. कौमुदगन्धिपतिः $>$ कौमुदगन्धीपतिः by P. 6. 3. 139 : संप्रसारणस्य। ('संप्रसारणस्य दीर्घः स्यादुत्तरपदे । कौमुदगन्ध्यायाः पुत्रः कौमुदगन्धीपुत्रः । कौमुदगन्धीपतिः'। सि. कौ.).

The *dīrghagrahaṇavādin* means to say that if the general injunction of '*dīrghaḥ*' had applied to Saṁprasāraṇa also, P. 6. 3. 139 : संप्रसारणस्य would

be superfluous. The long substitute would be automatically assured by '*dīrghaḥ*', still the rule संप्रसारणस्य is there. This indicates that the general injunction '*dīrghaḥ*' does not affect a saṁprasāraṇized vowel, in *viddha* as well as in कारीषगन्धीपतिः. Even after *dīrghagrahaṇa*, the short vowel in *viddha* is safe.

Observation : After ज्ञापकं, the MS reads सौ च before संप्रसारणस्य. That is erroneous. The rule सौ च (P. 6. 4. 13) teaches lengthening in शशी, वृत्रहा, पूषा etc. (Nom. sing. of शशिन्, वृत्रहन्, पूषन् etc.). It has nothing to do with Saṁprasāraṇa.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 8) एतदपि ह्रस्वनिवृत्त्यर्थं स्यात्, 'इको ह्रस्वोऽङ्यो ... इति । The opponent refutes this *jñāpaka* also. The framing of the rule संप्रसारणस्य does not necessarily prove that the *dīrghagrahaṇa* will not apply to Saṁprasāraṇa. The rule may be necessary, even if *dīrghagrahaṇa* applied to Saṁprasāraṇa, to counteract the shortening taught by P. 6. 3. 61 : इको ह्रस्वोऽङ्यो गालवस्य (which says that the final *ī ū ṝ* of the first constituent of a compound is shortened — unless *ī* is the fem. suffix *ṅī* — according to Gālava. Thus : ग्रामणिपुत्रः, ग्रामणीपुत्रः । ब्रह्मबन्धुपुत्रः, ब्रह्मबन्धूपुत्रः .) Since the rule has a useful purpose to serve, it cannot be a *jñāpaka* of the alleged non-application of the *dīrghaḥ* to Saṁprasāraṇa.

According to the tradition, the shortening taught by P. 6. 3. 61 : इको ह्रस्वो ... does not apply to कौमुदगन्धीपति etc., because that rule contains a fixed option; shortening is not available in the case of कौमुदगन्धी°. Read : '... कौमुदगन्धीपुत्रः । कौमुदगन्धीपतिः । 'इको ह्रस्वोऽङ्यो गालवस्य' इत्येतन्न भवति । व्यवस्थितविभाषा हि सा' (*Kāś.* under P. 6. 3. 139). Similarly *Sid-Kau.* : व्यवस्थितविभाषया ह्रस्वो न.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 9) तस्यैवेदं लिङ्गम् ... अनुवर्तेते. This sentence is apparently meant to corroborate what is said in the previous sentence. Two occurrences of the word *pūrva* can be made to continue in P. 6. 1. 108 : संप्रसारणाच्च (which teaches *pūrvarūpa* as a single substitute after the Saṁprasāraṇa) : from P. 6. 1. 102 : प्रथमयोः पूर्वसवर्णः and 107 : अमि पूर्वः. It means पूर्वः पूर्व एव, नान्यः (on the maxim द्विर्बद्धं सुबद्धं भवति 'what is tied twice is well tied'.) Bhar. says that this double appearance of *pūrva* is an indicator (*liṅgam*) of the purpose of P. 6. 3. 139 : संप्रसारणस्य : it is meant for counteracting shortness taught in P. 6. 3. 61 : इको ह्रस्वो. So it cannot indicate that the saṁprasāraṇized vowel will remain immune from lengthening taught by the proposed injunction '*dīrghaḥ*'. For this double *anuvṛtti*, see also the *Dīp.* above : इदमप्यत्रानुवर्तयितव्यं etc. (*l.* 5).

(*p.* 20, *l.* 10) अतो गुणे पर इति. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : पचन्तीति । 'अतो गुणे परः' इतीयता सिद्धम् । सोऽयमेवं सिद्धे सति यद् रूपग्रहणं करोति, तस्यैतत् प्रयोजनम् — यथाजातीयकं परस्य रूपं तथाजातीयकमुभयोर्यथा स्यादिति ।

This *Mbh.* discusses the last example, viz. पचन्ति. It is formed from पच् + अ (शप्) + अन्ति with a *pararūpa* Saṁdhi by P. 6. 1. 97 : अतो गुणे (where पररूपम् is continued from P. 6. 1. 94 : एङि पररूपम्). The opponent had expressed his apprehension that here also the single substitute will have to be lengthened by the proposed injunction '*dīrghaḥ*', resulting into a wrong form (**pacānti*). The advocate of *dīrghagrahaṇa* now says that no such fear be entertained. The word *-rūpam* (in *pararūpam*) will take care of it. How? If in the Pāṇinian system a long vowel had been desired here, Pāṇini would have simply read परः instead of पररूपम्. For, in that case the expanded rule would read as अतो गुणे एकः पूर्वपरयोः परो दीर्घः 'when a Guṇa vowel follows internally a short *a*, the following vowel in the lengthened form is the single substitute for both the preceding and the following'. In that case -रूप becomes superfluous. This superfluousness which would otherwise result can be removed only on the assumption that it indicates that *dīrghaḥ* does not apply to our present case. The form (*-rūpam*) of the following vowel is retained. The single substitute will be long only if the following vowel is long (as in *yaje* < *yaj* + *a* + *e*); it will be short if the following vowel is short. So no damage to *pacanti*. The proposed '*dīrghaḥ*' can stand.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 10) तत्र एकार ओकारश्च ... विज्ञायते. A question is asked in connection with the above explanation. There are three vowels called Guṇa : *a*, *e* and *o*. Of these *e* and *o* are already long. Even if Pāṇini had not read *-rūpa*, the long *e* and *o* themselves would result as single substitutes. So what is the utility of *-rūpa* in their case? 'True', is the reply. It is useful only in the case of *a*.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 11) इह तावत् खट्वर्श्यं इति. The *Mbh.* text represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : इह तावत् खट्वर्श्यो मालर्श्यं इति — दीर्घवचनादकारो न, अनान्तर्या-देकारोकारौ न। तत्र को दोषः? विगृहीतस्य श्रवणं प्रसज्येत।

The *dīrghagrahaṇavādin* having thus somehow explained that the general injunction '*dīrghaḥ*' will not affect single short *pūrvarūpa* and *pararūpa* substitutes, the position now is that that injunction be admitted to prevent three-mora etc. Guṇa and Vṛddhi substitutes. At this stage the opponent brings in a fresh objection with regard to one kind of Guṇa Saṁdhi, viz. *ā* + *ṛ*. In this environment, P. 6. 1. 87 : आद् गुणः teaches a single Guṇa substitute for both *ā* and *ṛ*. Of the three Guṇa vowels, *a* here materialises as the substitute on the basis of *āntarya*. With a further suffixing of *r* by P. 1. 1. 51 : उरण् रपरः, the final Saṁdhi from खट्वा + ऋश्यः is खट्वर्श्यः. Now the opponent argues that the proposed general injunction '*dīrghaḥ*' (= आद् अचि परे पूर्वपरयोरेको दीर्घो गुणादेशः स्यात्) will create a difficulty here ; no Saṁdhi will materialise. The vowels *e* and *o* cannot come in as a substitute because of absense of *āntarya*. (But

they find scope in cases like खट्वेन्द्रः and खट्वोढः.) And *a* also cannot come in because it is not long. So a hiatus (*-ā ṛ-*) will result undesiredly (प्रसज्येत). — स्थानम्, the place, i. e. the place of the original sound, *sthānin*, which is to be replaced.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 14) यथोक्तम् 'झकारभकारावपि पदान्तौ न स्तः' इति. The quotation झकार...is from the *Mbh.* further on, under ञमङणनम् । झभञ् । (*Mbh.* I. 36. 3). At first sight its purpose here is not clear, but in all probability it is meant to put forward a parallel to the unmaterialised *a* as the Guṇa substitute (in *khaṭvā* + *ṛśyaḥ*, for instance). The protagonist of the *dīrghagrahaṇa* will perhaps take objection to the statement : विगृहीतः श्रूयेत. *A* is a Guṇa, and as homogeneous with ā, it is bound to materialise. How can the rule be inoperative, as far as that part is concerned ? — he may ask. But that is not a serious lapse, says the opponent. Look at the *Mbh.* statement झकारभकारावपि etc. There the *Mbh.* is examining the proposal which seeks to read ञमङणनझभञ् instead of ञमङणनम् । झभञ् । The *Mbh.* there runs thus : कथं 'ङमो ह्रस्वादचि ङमुण्नित्यम्?' एतदप्यस्तु ञकारेण — 'ङञो ह्रस्वादचि ङञुण्नित्यम्' इति । नैवं शक्यम् । झकारभकारयोरपि हि पदान्तयोर्झकारभकारावागमौ स्याताम् । न झकारभकारौ पदान्तौ स्तः । एवमपि पञ्चागमास्त्रय आगमिनो वैषम्यात् संख्यातानुदेशो न प्राप्नोति । सन्तु तावद्येषामागमानामागमिनः सन्ति । झकारभकारौ न स्त इति कृत्वा आगमावपि न भविष्यतः ।

Here this is the problem : The rule ङमो ह्रस्वादचि ... (P. 8. 3. 32) says that ङमुट् (i. e. ङ्, ण् and न्) is the prefixed augment of an initial vowel when this latter follows a pada which ends in ङमुट् preceded by a short vowel (e. g. *pratyaṅ* + *ātmā* > *pratyaṅ ṅātmā*). If *m* is deleted and the whole is read as one Sū., what will happen to the *pratyāhāra* '*ṅam*' and how will we get the desired forms ? No problem, says the advocate of one-Sū. Instead of *ṅam* we now say *ṅañ* and read the rule as ङञो ह्रस्वादचि ङञुण्नित्यम्. But that will result, in the same environment, into *jh* and *bh* also as prefixed augments undesiredly, protests the opponent. He is, however, assured that there will be no such contingency because *jh* and *bh* as *pada*-finals is an impossibility (as they are replaced in that environment by *j* and *b* respectively). But, persists the opponent, in that case there will be five *āgamas* and only three *āgamins*; how will the principle of respectivity work ? Doesn't matter. In theory both number five each. In practice let the three *āgama*-s (*ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*) materialise, which have *āgamin*-s. If the remaining two (*jh* and *bh*) remain unmaterialised for want of *āgamin*-s (initial vowels following a final *jh* and *bh* after short vowels), well, let them.

Our unmaterialized Guṇa substitute *a* is like the unmaterialised augments *jh* and *bh*.

(*p*. 20, *l*. 15) तपरे गुणवृद्धी. After the above defect is pointed out, the advocate of the *dīrghagrahaṇa* slightly shifts his position. Since the linking of *dīrgha* with a single substitute in general causes difficulties he suggests that the word *dīrgha* be read in the rules which define Guṇa and Vṛddhi. The rules should be read as वृद्धिरादैज् दीर्घः and अदेङ् गुणो दीर्घः. This would achieve the goal, without creating any difficulties. He is now told finally that even this is not necessary. The provision is already made. The तपरकरण is already there in the definitions (तपरे गुणवृद्धी=तपरसंज्ञिसहचरिते गुणवृद्धिसंज्ञे Kaiy.). That will see that the substitutes Guṇa and Vṛddhi will be of two moras only. No *trimātra* or *caturmātra* substitute will force itself in the actual forms. The *dīrghagrahaṇa* was only suggested by the *taparavādin* as the diphthongs are read without *t* in the Akṣaras. Well, the *taparakaraṇa* may not be there in the Akṣaras., but it is there in the rules which define Guṇa and Vṛddhi. So no problem.

(*p*. 20, *l*. 15) यद्यपि संज्ञिनो ... गुणवृद्धिसंज्ञे इति. The wording तपरे गुणवृद्धी of the *Mbh*. is somewhat queer. It is really the *saṁjñin*-s that are तपर, viz. अ, ए ओ and आ ऐ औ; not the *saṁjñā*-s, viz. Guṇa and Vṛddhi. So we have to understand a sort of transferred epithet here. Bhar. gives three explanations : (1) The named, though different from names, take their number and gender, when identified with them. Cf. P. 1. 1. 22 : तरप्तमपौ घः. (2) तपरे does not qualify the names. It qualifies शास्त्रे, understood. (The rules वृद्धिरादैच् and अदेङ् गुणः contain *taparakaraṇa*.) (3) तपरे is not Nom. dual (neuter), but Locative sing. and is a विषयसप्तमी. So तपरे=तपरे विषये=तपरे संज्ञिनि.

(*p*. 20, *l*. 19) कस्य पुनस्तपरत्वम् ... इति युक्ता तत्कालप्रतिपत्तिः. In this passage the *Dīp*. discusses the question (ignored by Kaiy.) whether the *taparakaraṇa* in the rules P. 1. 1. 1–2 belongs to the names or the named. This is what is meant : P. 1. 1. 1–2 teach the name Vṛddhi for *ā* and *aic*, and the name Guṇa for *a* and *eṅ*. Here *aic* and *eṅ* are also, in their turn, names of *ai*, *au* and *e*, *o* respectively (P. 1. 1. 71 : *ādir antyena sahetā*). Now the question is : Does the *taparakaraṇa* belong to the names *aic* (i. e. *ai*) and *eṅ* (i. e. *e*), or to their named *ai*, *au* and *e*, *o* ? Difficulties are pointed out in both views and so also their solutions. So it does not matter which view you adopt.

The reason for the view संज्ञिनां तपरत्वम् is that a name, after all, is for the sake of the named which really matters. So, even though it apparently seems that Pāṇini has attached the sign (*liṅgam*) *t* to the name, ultimately it belongs to the named. यद्येवम् ... (*l*. 21) raises an objection. The named are not uttered. How are we to know which quantity of *e*/*o* is meant to which the name Guṇa is restricted by *t*, and which of *ai*/*au* to which Vṛddhi is restricted ? At the best one can say, on the strength of *taparakarṇa*, that the varieties of other durations

(सवर्णानाम्=भिन्नकालानाम्) will be excluded. But you cannot guarantee that the one that is intended, viz. of two moras, and that alone, will be available.

The reason for the view संज्ञायास्तपरत्वम् is, firstly, that the sign *t* is directly affixed to the *saṁjñā*, and secondly, this view is free from the defect in the other view pointed above. But its own weakness is that although in the case of *e* and *ai* other varieties (like three-mora) are excluded and the names are restricted to the uttered (two-mora) variety, because of their *taparakaraṇa* (as names), *o* and *au* stand in a different category altogether. The *Dīp.* says that in their case the result will be either of the two possibilities : (1) There will be no comprehension at all; or (2) there will be a comprehension of the vowels of all sorts of duration (*sarvakālasya*). It must be said here that the second possibility (सर्वकालस्य प्रतिपत्तिः) is understandable. Since there is no *taparakaraṇa* in the case of *o* and *au* of any duration even three-mora *o* will have to be named Guṇa, and a similar *au* Vṛddhi (by अणुदित् ...). The first possibility (ग्रहणमेव वा न स्यात्) cannot be understood. Whose comprehension is precluded ? And why ?

Pandit Bhagavat Shastri suggests that when the *Dīp.* suggests that 'either there will be no comprehension' (ग्रहणमेव वा न स्यात्), what is meant is that *o* will not be comprehended by *eṅ*, and *au* by *aic.*[1] The reason for this, he suggests, is that the *Dīp.* is probably making a point that P. 1. 1. 70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य will supersede P. 1. 1. 71 : आदिरन्त्येन सहेता (how it is not olear). When this latter rule (which sanctions a *pratyāhāra saṁjñā*) is superseded, naturally there is no *grahaṇa* of *o* by *eṅ* and of *au* by *aic.* The defence for such an extreme and unusual view (even for a *pūrvapakṣin*) seems to be that the *taparakaraṇa* (*t-eṅ* etc.) precludes the comprehension not only of the same vowel of a different duration, but also of other vowels whose comprehension is otherwise due by the rule आदिरन्त्येन सहेता. But if *eṅ* is not to comprise *o*, why should Pāṇini affix *ṅ* at all and form the *pratyāhāra* ? The *pūrvapakṣin* is probably himself aware of the weakness of his argument and so advances, as an alternative, the other possibility : अपि वा सर्वकालस्य प्रतिपत्तिः स्यात्.

The *Dīp.* संज्ञायास्तावत् तपरत्वे ··· इकारादयो ग्राहकाः (*l.* 25) refutes the objection against संज्ञायास्तपरत्वम्. The ultimate point seems to be that the rule आदिरन्त्येन सहेता will not be superseded; it will operate here also. So *o* and *au* will be conveyed first (by P. 1. 1. 71 : आदिरन्त्येन सहेता) and *o* and *au* thus conveyed will in their turn, convey, other varieties of *a* and *au* of the same length (by P. 1. 1. 70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य).

It is pointed out that the rule आदिरन्त्येन सहेता will not operate in the case of *et* and *ait* (or *t-e* and *t-ai*) only when there is no further constituent (like *ṅ*

1. ओकार-औकारौ, consistent with this explanation, is Accusative (not Nom.).

and *c* in the present case), because a final consonantal *it* constituent, required for a *pratyāhāra* (by P. 1. 1. 71 : आदिरन्त्येन सहेता) is then lacking (यत्र हि एच ... परिभाषा नोपतिष्ठते). In short this means that the affixion of *t* (for *tatkālasya grahaṇam*) does not preclude that vowel from forming a *pratyāhāra* and thus from conveying other phonemes by means of this kind of *saṁjñā*. — The *Dīp*. यस्य ग्रहणमस्ति ... तपरत्वात् apparently explains how *taparakaraṇa* applies to *o* and *au*. The final part of this passage (ततस्तर्हि ... इकारादयो ग्राहकाः) explains how *o* and *au*, though themselves not read (i. e. in P. 1. 1. 1–2) convey their other varieties having the same duration. It is like this : A *pratyāhāra* '*aṇ*', e. g., conveys many phonemes like *i*, *u* etc. These *i*, *u* etc., once conveyed, in their turn further convey *ī*, *ū* etc. So also with *o* and *au* here.

Observation : It is rather strange that Bhar. here calls आदिरन्त्येन सहेता a Paribhāṣā, rather than a *Saṁjñā* as it is usually done. Thus both *Nyāsa* and the *Padamañjarī* remark on this Sū. : इदमपि संज्ञासूत्रम्. The *Dīp*. probably used the word *paribhāṣā* in a loose or wider sense, meaning any rule which is not a *vidhi*. It may be mentioned in this context that even Abhyankar, in his *Paribhāṣāsaṁgraha* (pp. 465–492) gives, among Paribhāṣās, many Sūtras which are traditionally regarded as Saṁjñā-Sū.

(*p*. 21, *l*. 3) यदापि संज्ञिन ... युक्ता तत्कालप्रतिपत्तिः replies the objection against the view : संज्ञिनां तपरत्वम्. From *t-eṅ* one first understands *e* and *o* by आदिरन्त्येन सहेता. Similarly *ai* and *au* from *t-aic*. After these are known, they cause the comprehension of their other varieties of the same duration. This duration is to be understood as of two moras, since *t* appears in close proximity with *e* and *o* which are known to have two moras from the Akṣarasa. — यः संनिविष्टः सः is *jātau ekavacanam*. All the four, which find a place in the Akṣaras. (*saṁniviṣṭa-*) are meant. The substantive of संनिहितः 'close to' is तकारः (understood).

Observations : (1) The entire passage is rather obscure, even corrupt in some places. Explanation given is tentative. (2) The discussion proceeds on the view : तादपि परः, although this has yet to make its appearance in the *Mbh*. Bhar. seems to have anticipated it.

(*p*. 21, *l*. 6) तादपि परस्तपर इति. The discussion in the *Mbh*. has all along proceeded on the assumption that तपर means 'what is followed by *t*', the compound being taken as a Bahuvrīhi. (That Bhar. has anticipated the other view which takes the compound as Tatpuruṣa also, meaning 'what follows *t*', as remarked above is a different thing.) Naturally when तपरे गुणवृद्धी is given as an answer to the question कस्मादेवान्तर्यतः...त्रिमात्रचतुर्मात्रा आदेशा न भवन्ति, the opponent in *Mbh*. is perplexed. Where are *eṅ* and *aic* followed by *t* in P. 1. 1. 1 and 2 ?

Does not तपर mean 'that after which a *t* follows' (ननु च तः परो यस्मात् सोऽयं तपरः) ? — he asks. He is quietly told : Not necessarily ; it also means : what follows *t* (नेत्याह । तादपि परस्तपरः ।). On नेत्याह Nāg. comments : स एव तपर इति नेत्याहेत्यर्थः.

(*p*. 21, *l*. 6) अनयोरुपादानम् ... यौगपद्यादिति । The *Dīp*. explains the technicality of how two meanings are understood from a single expression.

In all the *Dīp*. mentions three technical ways in which this is achieved : (1) एकशेष, (2) तन्त्र, and (3) एकस्य शब्दस्य द्व्यर्थाभिधानम्. At first the *Dīp*. mentions only *ekaśeṣa* i. e. the grammatical phenomenon wherein two homophonous (*sarūpa*) expressions, if in the same case, merge into one; only one remains (hence *ekaśeṣa*; P. 1. 2. 64 : सरूपाणामेकशेष एकविभक्तौ). So तपरः = तपरश्च तपरश्च. Here one does not think of meaning at all; only form is considered (अनयोरुपादानमेकशेषात्, प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तस्यानुपादाने स्वरूपमात्राश्रयणात् । The प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त is the meaning). A possible objection against understanding an *ekaśeṣa* here is that an *ekaśeṣa* takes the total number (dual or plural as the case may be). It is never in the singular, whereas our तपरः is singular. Perhaps it is for this reason that Bhar. introduces the other two devices, both of which require a consideration of the meaning. Still he should have used some such expression as *vā* 'or'. If *ekaśeṣa* is not to be resorted to, then we either resort to *tantra* here, i. e. we understand that two तपर words, one meaning 'followed by *t*' and the other meaning 'what follows *t*' are rolled into one (in conformity with the view : अर्थभेदेन शब्दभेदः); or we take it as a single word capable of conveying both meanings, a *dviśakti* word (in accordance with the view एकः शब्दो बह्वर्थः : 'एकस्यैव वा शब्दस्य द्व्यर्थाभिधानयौगपद्यात्' as Bhar. says). — द्वौ योगौ ... संप्रसारणमिति. For the twofold interpretation put upon *taparaḥ* Bhar. cites the parallel of P. 1. 1. 45 : इग् यणः संप्रसारणम्. That rule has a twofold interpretation : (1) *ik* is substituted in the place of *yaṇ* (under certain specific conditions). (2) *ik*, thus substituted is named Saṁprasāraṇa. What is the justification of this twofold interpretation ? The twofold use of the term *Saṁprasāraṇa*, viz. sometimes in the Nom. case and sometimes in the oblique cases (विभक्तिविशेषनिर्देशात्), we are told, indicates this twofold interpretation. To explain, *saṁprasāraṇam* in the Nom. case, the भाव्यमानविभक्तिः (with the predicate *bhavati* understood), teaches the *saṁprasāraṇa* ; it is a predicate. So here the meaning No. 1 applies e. g. in P. 6. 1. 15 : वचिस्वपियजादीनां किति (संप्रसारणम्). On the other hand in rules like P. 6. 3. 139 : संप्रसारणस्य, in the भूतविभक्ति, where the vowel called Saṁprasāraṇa (the Saṁprasāraṇized vowel) is taught to be lengthened, the meaning No. 2 applies. Thus the विभक्तिविशेषनिर्देश — sometimes the Nom., sometimes the oblique — is an indication of the twofold meaning of इग्यणः संप्रसारणम्. Read the *Kāś*. : केचिदुभयथा सूत्रमिदं व्याचक्षते — वाक्यार्थः संज्ञी, वर्णश्चेति । 'इग्यण'

इति वाक्यार्थः स्थान्यादेशसंबन्धलक्षणः स संप्रसारणसंज्ञो भवति । यण्स्थानिक इग्वर्णः स संप्रसारणसंज्ञो भवतीति । तत्र विधौ वाक्यार्थ उपतिष्ठते — 'ष्यङः संप्रसारणम्', 'वसोः संप्रसारणम्' इति । अनुवादे वर्णः 'संप्रसारणाच्च' इति । On this the *Padam.* : कथं पुनरर्थद्वयमेकसूत्रस्य भवति ? तन्त्रेण, आवृत्त्या वा । अस्य च लिङ्गं विभक्तिविशेषनिर्देशः । यदयं 'ष्यङः संप्रसारणम्' इत्यादौ भाव्यमानविभक्त्या निर्देशं करोति, ततो ज्ञापयति वाक्यार्थः संज्ञेति । न हि तत्र वर्णस्य संभवः । 'संप्रसारणस्य' इत्यादौ तु भूतविभक्त्या निर्देशात् ज्ञायते – वर्णः संज्ञीति । न हि तत्र वाक्यार्थः संभवतीति ।

But what is such indication in the case of *taparaḥ* ? The reply is : 'सहिवहोरोदवर्णस्य' इति लिङ्गात्. The use of the word अवर्णस्य instead of अस्य is an indicator to Pāṇini's intention that sometimes तात्परः also is intended. To explain : The rule सहिवहोरोदवर्णस्य (P. 6. 3. 112) teaches substitution of *o* in the place of *a* of the roots *sah* and *vah* in certain environments. Here Pāṇini could simply say *सहिवहोरोदस्य. The *a* (in *asya*) could also stand for *ā* by अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः. (This is desired since forms like Aor. 3 du. उदवोढाम् are derived, in this system, from a preceding stage उद् + अ + वा°.) Also, on the view तः परो यस्य, the *t* could be connected only with the preceding *o*, leaving the following *a* unrestricted. Still Pāṇini says अवर्णस्य. This shows that the view तात् परः is also legitimate. So the *t* could restrict the following *a* to a short *a* (*ă*) only. Then the *ā* of *vāh* could not be replaced by *o*. So Pāṇini specifically says अवर्णस्य. This usage of his can be explained only on the hypothesis that तात्परः is as valid as तः परो यस्य. (See also above, Notes, *p*. 195, *ll*. 11–19.)

(*p*. 21, *l*. 9) एकस्यैव वा ... यौगपद्यादिति is the alternative to तन्त्र, wherein on the basis of the view एकः शब्दो बह्वर्थः, one and the same expression (here तपरः) is regarded as having more than one denotative capacity, and so capable of conveying many meanings simultaneously. — For these three devices, read Kaiy. : तन्त्रन्यायाश्रयणाद्, एकस्यैव द्विशक्तित्वाद्, एकशेषाश्रयणाद्वानेकार्थाभिधानमिति भावः । Here it may be mentioned incidentally that Nāg. objects to Kaiy's including *ekaśeṣa* on the ground of the difficulty of explaining the singular number here. Raghunath Shastri (Joint Editor, *Mbh.*, Nirṇayasāgara ed., 1932), on the other hand, expresses an opinion that the word *ekaśeṣa* in the *Prad.* here, as also sometimes in the *Mbh.*, is used in the sense of *āvṛtti* 'repetition'.

Observation : The word विप्रतिपत्तेः 'because of difference of opinion', is not easy to understand here, unless one takes *vipratipatti-* as a rare sideform of *dvipratipatti* 'understanding of two' i. e. of two meanings in the present case.

(*p*. 21, *l*. 10) किं दकारे प्रयोजनम् इति. The *Mbh.* which follows ... तादपि परस्तपर इति runs as follows : यदि तादपि परस्तपरः 'ऋदोरप्' इतीहैव स्यात् — यवः स्तवः । लवः पवः इत्यत्र न स्यात् । Here an objection is taken to the view तादपि परस्तपरः. If *t* is understood as restricting the quantity of a following vowel also,

then the forms like *lava* and *pava* cannot be explained. P. 3. 3. 57 : ऋदोरप् teaches that abstract nouns are formed from roots in *ṝ* and *ū̆*. So, as far as roots in *ū̆* are concerned, we have *yava*, *stava* etc. from *yu-*, *stu-* etc. which end in *u*; and *lava*, *pava* etc. from *lū*, *pū* etc. which end in *ū*. But now if the view तादपि परः is admitted, *t* will restrict the quantity of the following *u* (*ṝdor* is Gen. sing. of *ṝdu-*) to one mora with which it is uttered. The result will be that the rule ऋदोरप् will apply, as far as *u* is concerned, to roots in *u* only. Since it will not apply to roots in *ū*, it will not be possible to account for forms like *lava*, *pava*. To this objection, the protagonist of तादपि परः replies by saying that *d* in ऋदोरप् is not a substitute of any original *t* (by P. 8. 2. 39 : झलां जशोऽन्ते) as the opponent seems to think. It is *d* itself. As there is no *t* in that rule, there is no question of *taparakaraṇa* and consequently no harm to forms like *lava*, *pava* (*Mbh*. नैष तकारः। कस्तर्हि ? दकारः।). The view तादपि परः can stand. The opponent is astounded at this reply. In grammar nowhere is this *d* taught, as against *t*. And, what on earth could be its purpose (किं दकारे प्रयोजनम्) ?

This is followed by the reply of the protagonist of तादपि परः. The *Mbh*. reads : अथ किं तकारे ? यद्यसंदेहार्थस्तकारः, दकारोऽपि। अथ मुखसुखार्थस्तकारः, दकारोऽपीति। The *Dīp*. ऋकारान्तानां सर्वेषां etc. is really a comment on this *Mbh*. and not on किं दकारे प्रयोजनम् as one is likely to feel from the way the *Dīp*. quotes the *pratīka* of the *Mbh*.

(*p*. 21, *l*. 10) ऋकारान्तानां सर्वेषाम् ... तुल्यस्तकार इति. The protagonist of the तादपि परः view does not give a straightforward reply. The reply is given in the form of a counterquestion (प्रतिबन्दी) : what is the purpose of *t* here ? The opponent is a केवलबहुव्रीहिवादिन्, i. e. he accepts only तः परो यस्य view. So, in his own view, *t* can be connected only with *ṝ*. The following *u* remains unaffected. But of what use is *taparakaraṇa* to him in connection with *ṝ* ? The *taparakaraṇa* has two uses : (1) In the case of *aṇ*, restriction of the scope of a vowel to the quantity uttered (i. e. restricting the scope of अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः). That is not applicable here because *ṝ* is not *aṇ*. So the *nivartaka* function is not there. (2) In the case of non-*aṇ*, extending the scope of vowels uttered to their other varieties, provided they have the same quantity or duration. This purpose also is not applicable here, because all the verbal roots in *ṝ* read in the Dhātupāṭha are read with an Udātta, non-nasal *ṝ*. There is no radical *ṝ* which is not Udātta and not non-nasal. So the *pravartaka* function is also not there. Thus there being no technical purpose for *t*, the opponent will have to say that it is either मुखसुखार्थं or असंदेहार्थं. This utility can be claimed for *d* also. In which way then does *t* fare better than *d* ? Read Kaiy. also (where he brings in गुणानामभेदकत्वम्) : समासद्वयवादी तं प्रत्याह — अथ किं तकार इति। तव केवलबहुव्रीहि-

वादिनो निष्प्रयोजनं तपरत्वम्, ऋकारस्यानणुत्वाद्भिन्नकालानां ग्रहणाप्रसङ्गात्, गुणानां चाभेदकत्वात् तत्प्राप्यर्थत्वाभावात्। अथ तवासंदेहार्थौ मुखसुखार्थौ वा तकार एवं मम दकार इत्यर्थः।

So in the case of the two single substitutes Vṛddhi and Guṇa, these names can be restricted to the two-mora *aic* and *eṅ* respectively by means of *t* in वृद्धि-रादैच् etc. on the basis of तादपि परः view. Consequently the *taparakaraṇa* is not necessary in the Akṣaras.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 19, *l.* 25) The *daṇḍa* in AL after अन्यस्याभावात् is evidently through oversight. — (2) (*p.* 20, *l.* 1) MS वारभ्य°, AL चारभ्य°. — (3) (*p.* 20, *l.* 2) MS -वर्तंतेत्येव°, AL -वर्तत इत्येव°, Sw -वर्ततेत्येव°. — (4) (*p.* 20, *l.* 3) MSSw द्वित्वम्, AL दीर्धम् (for दीर्घत्वम्). — (5) (*p.* 20, *ll.* 2–3) After स्यात्, the MS AL repeat तस्मात् पूर्वग्रहणं पूर्वरूपार्थं क्रियते. — (6) (*p.* 20, *l.* 4) MSAL उभयांतरता मा भूत्. — (7) (*p.* 20, *l.* 7) AL (erroneously) ऋत उत् (for उत). — (8) (*p.* 20, *l.* 9) MSSw -पूर्वांय, AL पूर्वौं यौ (for -पूर्वत्वे). — (9) (*p.* 20, *l.* 10) MS इकार उकारश्च. — (10) (*p.* 20, *l.* 11) MSAL आकारार्थम्. — (11) *Mbh.* Ed. तर्हि (for तावत्). — (12) (*p.* 20, *l.* 13) MS खट्वाट, AL खट्वोदकम् (for खट्वोढा as in Sw). — (13) MS आवस्थितो, Sw अवस्थित. — (14) MSSw आकारश्च. — (15) (*p.*20, *l.* 14) MS सकार- (for झकार-). — (16) (*p.* 20, *l.* 17) MS सप्तमीयंतरे, AL °मी इयं तपर-, Sw °मी (अ)नन्तरे (for °मीयम्। तपरे). — (17) (*p.* 20, *l.* 20) MS तत्रोपा×यं, AL °पादेयं, Sw °पायं. — (18) (*p.* 20, *ll.* 21–22) MSSw किकालताम्, AL किंकालम् (for the tentatively suggested किंकाल[पर]म्). — (19) (*p.* 20, *l.* 23) MSSw अज्ञाने. — (20) (*p.* 20, *l.* 24) AL सवर्णः. — (21) Sw -औकार(:) (for -औकारौ). — (22) (*p.* 20, *l.* 25) ALSw सर्वकालेऽस्य. MS doubtful, whether ल or ले. — (23) (*p.* 20, *l.* 26) MSSw अत्र (for यत्र). — (24) (*p.* 21, *l.* 2) MS अशोकारौकार°, AL अणा एकार ओकार° (for अणेकारौकार° as in Sw). — (25) (*p.* 21, *l.* 4) MS संज्ञिनोतपणे, AL °नोऽतपराः, Sw °नो तपरा (ungrammatical) (for the emended °नस्तपराः). If नो of the MS is original, then °नोऽत्र तपराः or some such thing, which would account for नो and at the same time could keep the intended meaning intact, might have been the original reading. — (26) (*p.* 21, *l.* 5) MS तत्कालात् ह्णाति, AL तत्कालातत्काले, Sw °लान् (प्रतिपा)द(य)ति (for °लान् गृह्णाति). — (27) MSSw °पत्तिरिवम्, AL पत्तिरेव.

[4]

This section discusses the topic of the behaviour of the parts of diphthongs. The diphthongs apparently consist of parts : $a+i = e$; $a+u = o$ etc. Do these *a*, *i*, etc., the constituents of diphthongs, behave like their independent counterparts ? Do the rules which apply to the independent *a*, *i*, etc. apply to their counterparts which are constituent parts of diphthongs ? That is the question. Kāt. and Pat. examine both the possibilities and suggest remedies for defects which are detected in both the views. The *Mbh.* thus opens the topic :

इदं विचार्यते — य एते वर्णेषु वर्णैकदेशा वर्णान्तरसमानाकृतय एतेषामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं स्याद्वा न वेति। कुतः पुनरियं विचारणा ? इह हि समुदाया अप्युपदिश्यन्ते, अवयवा अपि। अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदायेऽवयवः। तद्यथा, वृक्षः प्रचलन् सहावयवैः प्रचलति। तत्र समुदायस्थस्यावयवस्यावयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं स्याद्वा न वेति जायते विचारणा।

Kaiy. puts the problem (समुदायस्थस्यावयवस्यावयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं स्याद्वा न वा *Mbh.*) thus : केवलवर्णकार्यमवयवेषु भवति न वेति विचारः।

(*l.* 1 above) *Mbh.* वर्णान्तर, the independent counterparts. — *ā*, *ī* etc. are here supposed to be made of *a* + *a*, *i* + *i* etc. ऋकारे रेफः etc. : *ṛ* and *ḷ* are supposed to be made of two parts, the consonantal *r* and *l*, accompanied by a vocalic element, what is called *ajbhakti*.

It is interesting to note that Pat. (and also here Bhar.) speaks merely of *avayava* 'part', while later commentators resolutely rule out any identity and speak of phonemes which are *avayavasadṛśa*. Read Kaiy. : आकारादिष्वकारसदृशावयवाः, ऋकारऌकारयो रेफलकारसदृशावयवौ ... Similarly Nāg. : अवयवग्रहणेन = अवयवसदृशवर्णग्रहणेन.—(*p.* 21, *l.* 15) अगादिचोदनासु, in injunctions where some operation is taught for phonemes *ak* etc. e. g. अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः (P. 6. 1. 101). Are the parts of diphthongs 'included in' i. e. equally subject to, the rules which teach an operation for their independent counterparts ? — that is the question.

(*p.* 21, *l.* 17) पूर्वो हेतुर्ग्रहणे, अपरहेतुरग्रहणे...The पूर्वो हेतुः refers to the *Mbh.* इह हि समुदाया...अवयवा अपि, the अपरहेतुः to अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदाये...प्रचलतीति. समुदायाः = *e*, *o* etc.; अवयवाः = *a*, *i* etc. The *prima facie* reason for अवयवग्रहणम् seems to be that they are read in the Akṣaras. So they are entitled to an operation taught for them, whether they happen to be independent or included in a diphthong etc. On the other hand, the reason for absence of अवयवग्रहणम् is that once they form a compound unit like a diphthong they lose their individual identity and have no title to an operation which is taught for their independent counterparts; instead the whole diphthong should undergo the operation taught for the diphthong as such.

(*p.* 21, *l.* 18) हेतुस्तु ग्रहणे ग्रहणम्, अग्रहणेऽग्रहणम्. This sentence explains the mechanism of the application or otherwise of the rules to parts of a diphthong etc. ग्रहणे = कार्यविधायिकासु चोदनासु ग्रहणे. ग्रहणम् = प्रत्याहारे ग्रहणम्. If a part can be shown as comprehended in a particular Pratyāhāra, then it is qualified for an operation taught for that Pratyāhāra. If it is not qualified for inclusion in a particular Pratyāhāra, it is not qualified for the operation concerned. The parts *a*, *i* etc. are included in the Pratyāhāra *ak*, so they are qualified for the *savarṇadīrgha* operation taught for *ak* in P. 6. 1. 101.

(*p*, 21, *l.* 21) यत्र चावयवपर ... अन्यत्रोपदेशात्. Here Bhar. gives some principles on the basis of which a particular Upadeśa is to be regarded either as

being in the capacity of parts (*avayavaparaḥ*) or in that of a whole (*samudāyaparaḥ*). The Upadeśa *aiuṇ* for instance could theoretically be *samudāyapara*, but it is to be understood as *avayavapara*, i. e. as teaching three different phonemes. (There is no other Upadeśa of these phonemes in the Akṣaras.). This applies to the abbreviated mentions (Pratyāhāra) also. When, e. g., an abbreviated name *aṅ* is used its named is not jointly the whole group *aṅ* (i. e. *a i u ṛ ḷ e o*), but the individual phonemes included in it. In the case of Upadeśa like हयवरट्, although a sound *a* accompanies every phoneme here (*ha*, *ya* etc.), it is simply meant to facilitate the pronunciation of *h* etc., and is therefore not a part of the Upadeśa here. (Also *a* is read, in its own right, elsewhere.) — Incidentally, why Bhar. says *valādiṣu* instead of *halādiṣu*is not clear. In the case of abbreviated names like *eṅ* (= *e*, *o*), the Upadeśa is *samudāyapara*, i. e. the two wholes or diphthongs, *e* and *o* are meant (समुदाय एवोपदिश्यते = ए-ओ-रूपौ समुदायौ उपदिश्येते).

(*p*. 21, *l*. 26) इहानुपदिष्टा ... फलादिवचनः. A particular case is mentioned here. P. 6. 1. 78 : एचोऽयवायावः teaches replacement of *ec* (i. e. *e*, *o*, *ai* and *au*) by *ay* etc., when a vowel follows. Now, according to the letter of the rule, *ay* e. g. is supposed to replace the diphthong *e*. How is it, then, that the parts *a* and *i* (of *e*) are also replaced? Surely *e* does not denote, linguistically, its parts *a* and *i* (anymore than the word 'tree' denoting fruit, one of its parts). True, says Bhar. Here inference is to be resorted to. Since a whole cannot be replaced unless and until the parts are replaced, and since the whole here is replaced, we have to infer that parts also are replaced.

(*p*. 22, *l*. 1) तत्रैवम् ... कार्यदेशेषु ग्रहणमिति. Here a crucial question is raised : When two different operations, one taught for the whole and the other for the part, present themselves simultaneously, which one does the part undergo? The reply is given in favour of the operation of the part. The reason for this is given as follows : In the case of an operation which is taught for the whole as such — e. g. the *ay* substitute — it is the whole which is directly mentioned as being replaced. The part is only implied. Further, since it has become subordinate (*pāratantryam āpāditaḥ*) to the whole, it sort of voluntarily retires (निवर्तते = स्थानित्वात् निव°) when a *samudāya-kārya* is due; e. g. *agna ā yāhi* (< *agnay ā yāhi* < *agne ā yāhi*). (Here there is no *yaṇ* substitute for the final *i* of *agne*.) That part has only a nominal existence. It is like a receptacle in which ghee is given to somebody. It is to be used because ghee cannot be given without some receptacle. But it does not form a part of the gift. The person who receives ghee, is supposed to return the receptacle!

Where, however, the part is directly mentioned, there is apparently no hindrance to the operation taught for the part. In *agne indra*, for example,

since *i* is included in *ak*, there the *savarṇa-dīrgha* operation, taught in P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः, becomes due. Here *i* is not replaced by *ay* because *ay* is directly taught as substitute for *e*, and only indirectly for *i*.

(*p*. 22, *l*. 7) सर्वत्र वर्णाः ... कार्यदेशेषु ग्रहणमिति. The *Dīp*. gives a parallel for the parts undergoing operations independently in spite of their being included in a whole. A phoneme like *a* is seen, for example, in wholes, viz. the *pada*-s like *arka*, *aśva* etc. Still this *a* undergoes operation taught for *ak* etc. On this analogy, a vowel *i* even if a part of *e*, will undergo an operation like *savarṇadīrgha* taught for *ak*, since it is comprehended by *ak*.

(*p*. 22, *l*. 8) यथैव पदादि ... ग्रहणमिति. The mere fact of being in a group does not prevent an individual's activity. A phoneme which is a part of a group of phonemes receives an operation in the same way as one which is a part of a Pada like *arka* etc. So, when it is recognized as a part of a Pratyāhāra, it is entitled to be recognized in the rules laying down operations.

(*p*. 22, *l*. 10) संप्रत्ययग्रहणे हेतुरुच्यते etc. From here onwards the *Dīp*. explains why समुदायस्थस्यावयवस्यावयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं न. The protagonist of अग्रहणम् is asked three questions : Does he mean to say (1) that there are no parts? or (2) that the parts are found to be there but the Upadeśa refers to the whole alone? or (3) that the parts are subordinated to the whole? The last alternative is acceptable to the अग्रहणवादिन् .

(*p*. 22, *l*. 14) तत्र यथैव ... प्रतिपद्यन्तेऽवयवाः. Here the *Dīp*. makes it clear that the parts of a diphthong, say *a* and *i* of *e*, get the designation *ec* ; they are also replaced by the substitute (*ay*) like *e*. But, all the same, their designation (*ec*) is only secondary. When some operation is taught for *ec* as such, *ec*, primarily so called, will alone undergo it and not *a* and *i*, who have that designation only secondarily. They have that designation, but no operation. Bhar. gives a parallel from grammar itself. The word *praṣṭhī* (also optionally *prāṣṭhī*) means 'a leader's wife' and is formed from *praṣṭha* 'leader' with the suffix *ṅīṣ* according to P. 4. 1. 48 : पुंयोगादाख्यायाम् . In the *Mbh*. on this rule two alternative ways are suggested in order to arrive at the form *praṣṭhī*. The one (suggested by Kāt.) is to apply first *tasyedam* (P. 4. 3. 120) and then this *aṇ* be dropped optionally. In the other alternative (suggested by Pat.) it is not necessary to delete *aṇ*, because the suffixion of *aṇ* itself is optional (by Mahāvibhāṣā), and the form *praṣṭhī* can be regarded as formed without *aṇ*. But a difficulty pointed out here is how, in the absense of a Taddhita suffix, the derived word *praṣṭha* can denote someone or something connected with the leader (*tasyedam*), viz. his wife. It is suggested, as a reply, that the word *praṣṭha* itself can primarily mean the wife of a *praṣṭha*. This naturally raises

the question how the wife, who does not actually lead, can be called a (female) leader (*prastha*). The reply given is that she does not have to do anything (like leading) to earn the designation *prastha*. Just as, even when she herself may not commit any sin, still as a Pativratā, she has to share the evil consequences of her husband's sins, similarly, without being engaged in the activity of leading, she automatically gets the designation 'a leader'. Similarly, it is suggested in the *Dīp.*, *a* and *i* can get the designation *e*, without having to undergo its operation. Read :

'पुंयोगादाख्यायाम् (P. 4. 1. 48) ।' ... किं पुनरिहोदाहरणम् ? प्रष्ठी, प्रचरी। कथं पुनरयं प्रष्ठशब्दोऽकारान्तः स्त्रियां वर्तते ? तस्येदमित्यनेनाभिसंबन्धेन। ... यद्येवं 'पुंयोगादाख्यायां तद्धितलुग्वचनम्' (वा. १)। पुंयोगादाख्यायां तद्धितस्य लुग्वक्तव्यः। तस्येदम्' (पा. ४. ३. १२०) इति प्राप्नोति। न तर्हीदानीं भवति प्राष्ठ्य इमाः, प्राचर्य इमा इति ? भवति च। विभाषा लुग् वक्तव्यः। यदा लुक् तदा प्रष्ठी, यदा न लुक् तदा प्राष्ठी। यद्येवम्, नार्थो लुका। विभाषा तद्धितोत्पत्तिः। यदा तद्धितोत्पत्तिस्तदा प्राष्ठी, यदा न तद्धितोत्पत्तिस्तदा प्रष्ठी। एवमपि लुग् वक्तव्यो, न ह्यन्तरेण तद्धितस्य लुकं परार्थे शब्दो वर्तेत।

यदि पुनस्तस्यामेव प्रष्ठशब्दो वर्तेत। कथं पुनस्तस्यामप्रतिष्ठमानायां प्रष्ठशब्दो वर्तेते ? यथैव ह्यसावकुर्वती किंचित् पापं तत्कृतान् वधबन्धनपरिक्लेशाँल्लभत एवं प्रष्ठशब्दमपि लभते। (*Mbh.* II. 217. 13–25)

Observation : Kaiy. holds a different view. He says that the parts of a diphthong do *not* get the designation of that diphthong. If they are replaced by *ay* etc., that is because it is unavoidable (*nāntarīyakatvāt*).

(*p.* 22, *l.* 17) एतत् प्रतिपादयति ... कथं वा प्रतिपद्येरन् इति. The point made in this *Dīp.* is that a part and a whole are two different categories altogether. A diphthong is not a mere cluster of simple phonemes; it is an entirely new phoneme, a different category altogether. It is like the species Narasiṁha. It may have some similarity with man and some with lion. Still it is an entirely different species from both man and lion. There are no parts in a whole. — After पुरुषजातेः, one may add सदृशश्च सिंहजातेः, to make the parallel complete. तन्मांसा° = नरसिंहमांसा°.

(*p.* 22, *l.* 22) अपरः प्रकारो ... प्रचलनं यदवयवानामिति. Another way in which an operation can be denied to parts. All this talk about parts and wholes and about the capacity or otherwise of parts participating into operation is based upon the distinction between the two. But the parts completely merge themselves into the whole. The two become one. Where is then the possibility of the parts separately undergoing any operation ? The subject of उच्यते is ग्रहणवादिना understood. (Here the *Mbh.* अभ्यन्तर is practically taken in the sense of विलीन.)

(*p.* 22, *l.* 27) अथ वा, इह ... गर्गादिबिदादिपाठात्. A third alternative explanation. In this context of the relation between the whole and the parts the

Dīp. refers to a discussion occurring in the Āhnika I of the *Mbh.* regarding the role played by the *gargādi-bidādi* lists. According to one view (which seems to be the final view of Pat.) these lists serve a twofold purpose : They demonstrate the correct form of a phoneme, a part, as free from defect like *kala*, and they can also demonstrate the correct form of the whole word. According to another view, the lists can vouch for only the correctness of the whole (word), not the part (phoneme). Bhar. now says that the present *Mbh.* passage : इह समुदाया ... समुदायेऽवयवः also expresses two views. According to the first view, both parts and the whole are intended to be expressed in diphthongs (उभयमप्युपदिश्यते). Both are meant. तात्पर्येण = अवयवपरतया समुदायपरतया च. It is curious that the exposition ends with a parallel which, on Bhar's own statement, is only a *pūrvapakṣa* in the *Mbh.*

I quote a relevant portion from Kaiy's *Prad.* to illustrate his agreement with and difference from Bhar. : आकारादिष्वकारादिसदृशाववयवा ऋकारऌकारयो रेफलकार-सदृशावयवौ संध्यक्षरेष्वकारेकारोकारसदृशाः। तत्र केवलवर्णकार्यमवयवेषु भवति न वेति विचारः। इह हि समुदाया अपीति। ऋऌएओऐऔ इति। अवयवा अपीति। अइउण्ऱ्हलणिति। तत्र समु-दायपरे निर्देशे संनिहिता अप्यवयवा नान्तरीयकत्वादेजादिसंज्ञां न लभन्ते, अवयवपरे च निर्देशे समुदायो न संज्ञाभाक्। यथा ह्यवेत्यादावनच्कस्य हलो दुःखेनोच्चार्यत्वान्निर्दिष्टोऽप्यकारोऽन्यत्र प्राधान्येन निर्देशाद्धलादिसंज्ञां न प्रतिपद्यते इति दध्यत्रेत्यादावनच्क एव यणादेशः प्रवर्तते। तत्रास-त्यामप्येजादिसंज्ञायामयादयः समुदायादेशा अपि नान्तरीयकत्वादवयवान् निवर्तयन्ति। एवं स्थिते अग्ने इन्द्र इत्यादौ यत्रावयवकार्यं प्राप्नोति समुदायकार्यं च तत्रान्तरङ्गत्वात् तत्र च साक्षात् चोदित-त्वात् प्रत्यक्षत्वात् परत्वाच्च अवयवकार्यप्रसङ्गः। अवयवावगतिपूर्वकत्वाद्धि समुदायावगमस्य समु-दायकार्यं बहिरङ्गम्। अयादीनां चावकाशः 'अग्न आ याही'ति।... तत्र यथा दधीन्द्र इत्यत्र दधि-शब्दस्थ इकारः सवर्णदीर्घत्वं प्रतिपद्यते, एवमेकारस्थोऽपि प्रतिपद्येत।... इत्येवं ग्रहणपक्षाशङ्काबीज-मुपन्यस्तम्। इदानीमग्रहणपक्षाशङ्काबीजमुपन्यस्यते — अभ्यन्तरश्चेति। तिरोहितत्वादवयवानां समुदायकार्ये पारतन्त्र्यात् स्वकार्यस्याप्रयोजकत्वान्नरसिंहवज्जात्यन्तरयोगाद् वर्णान्तरसारूप्यमात्रेण तत्कार्याप्रवर्तनादित्यर्थः।

Readings : (1) (*p.* 21, *l.* 13) *Mbh.* ed. वर्णान्तरसमा°. — (2) (*p.* 21, *l.* 15) MS किमते अगाादपोदना°; AL किमेतत्। अणादय उदिताः, ता°; Sw किमेते अणादयो दता°. The following discussion justifies our reconstruction : किमेते अगादिचोदना°. — After °स्वन्तर्भूतास्, the MS reads तच्कयवा (AL तदवयवा; Sw ता (?)। [अ] वयवा) अपि। अभ्यंतरश्च समुदायेवयवः. Of this, from यवा onwards is a passage anticipated from the *Mbh.* and so not included in our ed. I do not know what the first two letters mean. — (3) (*p.* 21, *l.* 18) AL Sw अपरो. — (4) MS र्थेस्वनि°; AL अर्थेस्त्वनि°; Sw ऽअर्थेस्य नि°. Although the MS clearly reads र्थे, meaning has nothing to do here. I tentatively follow Pt. Bhagavat Shastri's suggestion and read ऽप्यत्र नि° which appears to me most satisfactory. — (5) (*p.* 21, *l.* 19) After °ष्ववयवा, AL insert a न. This has not only no support of the MS, but it also actually goes against the intention of the text. ग्रहण *is* there. The insertion of न is no doubt influenced by

the following अग्रहणात् (retained in both eds.). But that is clearly an error. I, therefore, have emended it to ग्रहणात्. — (6) (*p*. 21, *l*. 21) MS तत्र. — (7) (*p*. 21, *l*. 22) Sw नोच्यते (for नेष्यते). — (8) MS अड्वानड्वा; AL अण् वा अड् वा; Sw अड्वानड्वा. — (9) (*p*. 21, *l*. 23) MSALSw के तर्हि. — (10) MS °स्यात्रोपदेशात × × × चाउश्चार°; AL °स्य नोपदेश इति । ह् य् व् र् लश्च उचार°; Sw °स्यात्रोपदेशात् ... लघ्वा उचार°. AL अशक्याः. Although some part of the sentence is lost, its meaning is clear with the help of Kaiy. — (11) (*p*. 21. *l*. 26) MS इनुपदिष्टा; AL Sw इह उपदिष्टा. — (12) (*p*. 21, *l*. 27) MS समुदायावयवादेश; AL °यावयादेशं; Sw °योऽवयवादेशं. — (13) (*p*. 21, *l*. 28) Sw drops ते. — (14) (*p*. 22, *l*. 1) The MS तत्रैमपास्यति is prob. to be emended to तत्रैवमुपस्थितं as AL do. — (15) (*p*. 22, *l*. 3) Sw °यवा ... दिताः ... तंन्ते. — (16) (*p*. 22, *l*. 4) Sw भोजने. — (17) (*p*. 22, *l*. 5) MS तदेमपि; Sw तदेव (दत्त)मपि. — (18) (*p*. 21, *l*. 7) Sw सत्वत्र; AL सन्त्यत्र° (for सर्वत्र). — (19) MS अर्काचादिशु; AL अक् अच् आदिषु; Sw अत्काचादिषु. — (20) MS °स्थिताकचो°; Sw °स्थितां कं चो° — (22) (*p*. 22, *l*. 8) Sw गृह्यमाणात् . — (22) (*p*. 22, *l*. 11) Sw प्रत्याहारे समु°. — (23) (*p*. 22, *l*. 13) MS समुदायवस्थ. — (24) (*p*. 22, *l*. 13) MSSw अपि (for अथ). MS अभ्यन्तरीयकृत्या°.— (25) (*p*. 22, *l*. 14) MS °रीकृतति; Sw °रीकृत (इ)ति. — (26) ALSw एत्वमपि. — (27) (*p*. 22, *l*. 18) MSSw अंति (for ऽस्ति). — (28) (*p*. 22, *l*. 19) MSALSw नरसिंहजातेः. AL पुरुषजातिः. — (29) (*p*. 22, *l*. 20) MS सिंहेमानायता°; AL सिंहमात्रमानी°. — (30) MS तन्मासा°; AL तन्मात्रा° (for तन्मांसा° as in Sw). न is not read anywhere. I have supplied it as it is required by the consideration of the meaning. — (31) (*p*. 22, *l*. 22) MS भेदश्रमाश्रि°; AL भेदश्रममाश्रि°.— (32) (*p*. 22, *l*. 23) MS समुदोयः. Sw अन्ये — अवयवाः समुदायः. — (33) (*p*. 22, *l*. 25) Sw [अ]वयवाः (for °यवौ). — (34) MS सन्निवेष्टा; Sw °विष्टा. — (35) (*p*. 23, *l*. 2) MS इट; AL इष्टः; Sw इह (for इष्टः). — (36) MSAL समुदाय (for °दायार्थ).

[4. 1]

समानाक्षरविधिप्रतिषेधः. The full text of this *Vār*. is : वर्णैकदेशा वर्णग्रहणेन चेत् संध्यक्षरे समानाक्षरप्रतिषेधः. It is explained in the *Mbh*. thus : वर्णैकदेशा वर्णग्रहणेन चेत् (the *Chāyā* adds the words गृह्यन्ते, तदा) संध्यक्षरे समानाक्षराश्रयो विधिः प्राप्नोति । स प्रतिषेध्यः । अग्ने इन्द्र । वायो उदकम् । 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' इति दीर्घत्वं प्राप्नोति । It means that if parts are also understood when their independent counterparts are uttered, then in cases like *agne* (now = **agnai*) + *indra*, the single long substitute, taught (for simple vowels : समानाक्षर) by P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः will become due undesiredly. It will have to be prohibited.

(*p*. 23, *ll*. 4–5) समुदायावयवाश्रयौ ... दीर्घत्वं प्राप्नोति. Bhar. explains the *prakriyā* as to how the single long substitute becomes finally due. Two operations present themselves simultaneously : (1) the substitute *ay* for *e* (of *agne*) by एचोऽयवायावः (P. 6. 1. 78), which is a समुदायाश्रयविधि. (2) The single long substitute for *i* (the final of **agnai*) + *i* by अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः (P. 6. 1. 101)

which is an अवयवाश्रयविधि. The *Dīp.* further says that both these operations have their own exclusive fields of operation. The *ay* substitute finds scope in cases like *agne+ā+yāhi* (where the rule अकः ... cannot encroach), while the single long substitute finds scope in cases like *dadhi+indraḥ* (where the rule एचोऽयवायावः cannot interfere). In a case like *agne+indra* both the rules claim this as their own field, because conditions for both operations are there. As elsewhere in such cases, the latter rule in the order of *Aṣṭ*, viz. अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः (P. 6. 1. 101) will prevail.

(*p.* 23, *l.* 6) अथ वा ... बलीयः इति। Previously *vipratiṣedha*, which leads to the later operation by P. 1. 4. 2 : विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्, was given as the reason why in *agne+indra* the single long substitute would supersede the *ay* substitute. Now Bhar. gives another reason also for the same. As far as the *i* is concerned, the single long substitute is directly taught for it, since *i* is included in *ak* which is the subject of P. 6. 1. 101. The substitute *ay*, however, is not taught directly for it. It is taught, primarily and directly, for *e*, and only secondarily and indirectly for *i* which forms a part of it. That operation, in its case, is only *ānumānika*, known from inference, while a single long substitute is *sākṣācchiṣṭa*, and hence, more powerful. — संप्रतीयो is obscure. Could it be संप्रधार्यो 'to be understood as'?

(*p.* 23, *l.* 8) यणादेशे कथम् ... मध्येपवादाः पूर्वान् इति वा. A question is asked about the possibility of the *yaṇ* substitute, taught by P. 6. 1. 77 : इको यणचि, in the example under consideration. A *yaṇ* substitute is as much directly taught for *i* (*i* is included in *ik*) as the single long substitute. How does the *yaṇ* substitute fare *vis-à-vis* the single long substitute? The reply given is that it is superseded by the *ay* substitute. Two reasons are advanced for this view: (1) If *yaṇ* substitute were to take place here also (apart from cases like *dadhi+indra*), there will be no scope anywhere for the *ay* substitute. So under these circumstances *ay* etc. supersede the *yaṇ* substitute. This is in accordance with the Paribhāṣā : येन नाप्राप्ते यो विधिरारभ्यते स तस्य बाधको भवति which states that a specific rule which would otherwise find no scope because some more general rule is already invariably present there sets aside that general rule and operates itself.

(2) According to the Pari. (60) मध्येऽपवादाः पूर्वान् विधीन् बाधन्ते नोत्तरान्, an exception, which is placed between general rules which both precede and follow it, supersedes only preceding general rules; it does not supersede the following ones. In the present case the sequence of rules is as follows :

इको यणचि P. 6. 1. 77

एचोऽयवायाव: P. 6. 1. 78

अक: सवर्णे दीर्घ: P. 6. 1. 101

समानाक्षर°. समान which means 'simple (vowels)' (the *ak* of Pāṇini) is a term of older grammarians. Cf. Kaiy. : समानशब्देन पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देशात् अकोऽभिधीयन्ते 'दश समाना:' इति वचनात्। Similarly Nāg. : 'अ आ इ ई उ ऊ ऋ ॠ ऌ ॡ दश समाना:' इति पूर्वव्याकरणवचनादित्यर्थ:. The term *samāna* is used in some later grammars also, e. g. the Kātantra : दश समाना: (1. 1. 3), समान: सवर्णे दीर्घीभवति परश्च लोपम् (1. 2. 1, corresponding to P. 6. 1. 101 but with a different technique).

Readings : (1) (*p*. 23, *l*. 5) MS AL दीर्घेत्यस्य; Sw दीर्घ इत्यस्य. — (2) (*p*. 23, *l*. 7) MS आनुनासिक: (rightly emended into आनुमानिक: by the eds.).—(3) MS संप्रतीयो; AL °ति यो; Sw °तीय: (to be emended into संप्रत्येयो or संप्रधार्यो ?). MS दार्घात्वे:; AL दीर्घ: स तु; Sw दीर्घस्तु. — (4) MS °छिष्टा बलीय:; AL °च्छिष्टो बलीयान्; Sw °च्छिष्टो बलीय:.

[4. 1. 1]

यदयं दीर्घाच्छे ... etc. In the *Vār*. 6 Kāt. pointed out a difficulty about the simple vowels. In the *Vār*. 7 : दीर्घे ह्रस्वविधिप्रतिषेध: he points out a similar difficulty about the short vowels (supposed to be parts of long vowels) and says that operations taught in connection with short vowels will similarly have to be prohibited in the case of their counterparts in long vowels, if वर्णैकदेशा वर्णग्रहणेन गृह्यन्ते. Pat. illustrates this by taking the case of आलूय etc. (gerund from *ā* + *lū*). Here the gerund is formed with the suffix *lyap* (P. 7. 1. 37 : समासेऽनञ्पूर्वे क्त्वो ल्यप्). Now, when a Kṛt suffix with a code-letter *p* follows, it gives rise to an augment *tuk* (= *t*) for a preceding short radical vowel (P. 6. 1. 71 : ह्रस्वस्य पिति कृति तुक्), e. g. *sukṛt* (formed from *sukṛ* + *kvip* by P. 3. 2. 89). Since now *lū* = *luu*, the augment *t* undesiredly results, which therefore will have to be prohibited. Read the *Mbh*. : दीर्घे ह्रस्वाश्रयो विधि: प्राप्नोति, स प्रतिषेध्य:। आलूय प्रलूय — ह्रस्वस्य पिति कृति तुग् भवतीति तुक् प्राप्नोति। Having thus first explained Kāt's view, Pat. now proceeds to show that the suggestion is superfluous. The prohibition is not necessary. When Pāṇini frames the rule दीर्घात् (P. 6. 1. 75), he has already hinted that a short vowel which is a part of a long vowel does not undergo the operation taught in connection with an independent short vowel. "नैष दोष:। आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति — न दीर्घे ह्रस्वाश्रयो विधिर्भवतीति, यदयं दीर्घाच्छे तुकं शास्ति। Bhar. in the *Dīp*. here quotes this last sentence as the *pratīka*.

For understanding this argument, which aims at making the prohibition unnecessary, and its refutation by the other man it is necessary to know the relevant rules in their sequence. They are :

6. 1. 71 : ह्रस्वस्य पिति कृति तुक् । सुकृत्, अग्निचित्.

6. 1. 72 : संहितायाम् ।

6. 1. 73 : छे च [ह्रस्वस्य, तुक्] । इच्छति, वृक्षच्छाया.

6. 1. 74 : आङ्माङोश्च [छे, तुक्] । आच्छादयति, मा च्छैत्सीत्.

6. 1. 75 : दीर्घात् [छे, तुक्] । ह्रीच्छति.

6. 1. 76 : पदान्ताद्वा [दीर्घात्, छे, तुक्] । लक्ष्मीछाया, लक्ष्मीच्छाया.

The opponent of the prohibition argues : P. 6. 1. 75 teaches the suffixion (P. 1. 1. 46) of the *tuk* augment after a long vowel when *ch* follows. So from the root *hrīch* (*P. Dh.* I. 225), we have, after palatalisation of *t*, *hrīcchati*. It is argued now that if a short part of a long vowel had got this *tuk*, P. 6. 1. 75 would be superfluous. For *hrīch* (now = **hriich*) would have a *tuk* addition after the last *a* by P. 6. 1. 73 itself. In that case P 6. 1. 75 would be redundant and Pāṇini would not have framed that rule. Still he frames it. That suggests that the part is not eligible for *tuk* in *hrīcchati*. Just as *tuk* is not available in *hrīcchati*, it equally cannot come in in forms like *ālūya*. The opponent's fear is groundless. The prohibition suggested by Kāt. is not necessary.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 10) दीर्घात् परो ... पूर्वस्य इति. This *Dīp*. incidentally makes a clarification, viz. that *dīrghasya* is understood in P. 6. 1. 75. The element to which an augment is to be affixed, is usually mentioned in the Genitive. But in the present rule there is no Genitive. Instead, we have one Ablative and one Locative (*dīrghāt*, *che*). So Bhar. interprets the rule like this : दीर्घात् परो यश्छस्तस्मिन् (परतः यः पूर्वो, नाम दीर्घः, तस्य) तुग् भवति.

Ordinarily, on account of the Ablative *dīrghāt*, the *tuk* should be an augment (suffixed) of *ch* by P. 1. 1. 67 : तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य. At the same time, because of the Locative *che*, the augment should belong to the preceding long vowel by P. 1. 1. 66 : तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य. In case of conflict, as here, where both cases are present, the tradition has a Pari. (70) : उभयनिर्देशे पञ्चमीनिर्देशो बलीयान्. So by तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य the *tuk* should have come in as a suffixed part of the consonant *ch*. But the Pari. is not universal. The *Sid-Kau*. observes : दीर्घस्यायं तुक्, न तु छस्य.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 11) ननु चैकारौ° ... भूयसी मात्रा. The protagonist of prohibition repudiates the *jñāpaka*. The framing of the rule *dīrghāt* can be explained on another hypothesis also. That rule may be meant to account for the *tuk* after *ai* (e. g. *aicchat*) or *au*. According to one view the constitution of *ai* and *au* is : *a* half a mora + *i*/*u* 1½ moras. Here *tuk* is desired, but there is no short component at the end. So, to secure *tuk*, the rule *dīrghāt* is necessary. In other

words, that rule does not necessarily suggest that the short part does not get the *tuk*. The prohibition is necessary.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 12) तत्रापि शक्यम् ... कर्तुमिति. This is not clear.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 13) योगविभागो लिङ्गम्, तुक् न भवतीति. This refers to the following *Mbh.* : नैतदस्ति ज्ञापकम्। अस्ति ह्यन्यदेतस्य वचने प्रयोजनम्। किम्? 'पदान्ताद्वा' इति विभाषां वक्ष्यामीति। यत्तर्हि योगविभागं करोति। इतरथा हि 'दीर्घात् पदान्ताद्वा' इत्येव ब्रूयात्। Here the protagonist of prohibition repudiates the *jñāpaka*. He says that the rule *dīrghāt* is not for cases like *hrīcchati*. (That is taken care of by P. 6. 1. 73 with the second *i* in *hriich*). *dīrghāt* is meant to be connected with the following (76) rule : *padāntād vā* so as to secure the option of the *tuk* when the preceding long vowel is at the end of a *pada* (e. g. *lakṣmīcchāyā*). Since the rule *dīrghāt* can be thus explained differently, it cannot necessarily be a clue to Pāṇini's alleged intention that short parts of long vowels do not get the *tuk*.

The *Mbh*. यत्तर्हि योगविभागं करोति (paraphrased in the *Dīp*. with योगविभागो लिङ्गम्, तुक् न भवतीति।) gives the final reason in favour of understanding that Pāṇ. does not intend that the operation taught for independent simple vowels should apply to their counterparts which are parts of composite vowels. If Pāṇ. had merely wished, in framing *dīrghāt*, to make the *tuk* after a long *pada*-final optional, he would have simply read the two as a single rule : दीर्घात् पदान्ताद्वा. He would not have then read them as two different rules. But he does it. So it is clear that P. 6. 1. 75 : दीर्घात् is an independent rule teaching the *tuk* for a long vowel (which incidentally suggests that the short parts do *not* get the *tuk*), while its *anuvṛtti* in 76: पदान्ताद्वा makes the *tuk* optional for a *pada*-final long vowel. Since the *tuk* is not due for a short part, its prohibition taught in the *Vār*. is unnecessary.

[4. 1. 2]

तपरकरणसामर्थ्यान्न भविष्यति. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : इह तर्हि खट्वाभिः, मालाभिः — 'अतो भिःस ऐस् (पा. ७. १. ९)' इत्यैस्-भावः प्राप्नोति। तपरकरणसामर्थ्यान्न भविष्यति। Here the protagonist of prohibition brings forward another case. P. 7. 1. 9 : अतो भिस ऐस् teaches substitution of *ais* in the place of *bhis* after a nominal stem ending in *a*. It may apply to stems like *mālā*, *śālā* (**mālaa*, *śālaa*) etc. Being undesired, it has to be prohibited. The reply is that it is unnecessary. The *t*-suffixion (in *ato*), which restricts the operation to a short *a*, is a guarantee for it. For, if Pāṇ. had wanted *ais* even after a stem in *ā*, why should he make the *t*-suffixion ? He would have simply read *āt* instead of *ataḥ*. Thus this *t*-suffixion, which would otherwise become meaningless, shows that there is no *ais* after *ā*-stems.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 14) अत्र हि प्रवृत्तिः ... अनुमानश्रुत्या. In this *Dīp*. Bhar. gives a philosophical explanation of the above argument. The rule (अतो भिस ऐस्) has two parts : an applicational (*pravṛtti*) part and a non-applicational (*nivṛtti*) one. The *a* (of *at* in *ato*) concerns the application of the rule to *a*, while the *t* concerns its non-application. By P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित् सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः *a* stands for all the varieties of *a* (i. e. including *ā* etc.), and so *-ais* is taught directly (*sākṣāc chrutir*) for all of them. On the other hand the next rule (70 : तपरस्तत्कालस्य) restricts, on account of *t*, the understanding of *a* to only short *a*, and thus indirectly (*anumānaśrutyā*) leaves out the *-ais* from *ā*-stems. This is the ordinary practice. But if we were to accept the opponent's view, that the *a* in *ā* will necessitate *-ais* after *ā* also, then the non-applicational part would remain unfulfilled (*nivṛttir akṛtārthā*).

[4. 1. 3]

(*p*. 23, *l*. 17) यदयमातोऽनुपसर्गे इति. The protagonist of prohibition brings forward yet another case of an *avayavakārya* which will have to be prohibited. The *Mbh*. concerned runs thus : इह तर्हि, याता वाता — 'अतो लोपः' आर्धधातुके इत्यकारलोपः प्राप्नोति। ननु चात्रापि तपरकरणसामर्थ्यादेव न भविष्यति। अस्ति ह्यन्यत् तपरकरणे प्रयोजनम्। किम्? सर्वस्य लोपो मा भूदिति। अथ क्रियमाणेऽपि तपरे परस्य लोपे कृते पूर्वस्य कस्मान्न भवति? एरलोपस्य स्थानिवद्भावादसिद्धत्वाच्च। एवं तर्ह्याचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति, नाकारस्थस्य अकारस्य लोपो भवतीति, यदयम् 'आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः' इति ककारमनुबन्धं करोति।

P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः teaches the elision of a stem-final *a* when an Ārdhadhātuka suffix follows. (So *cikīrṣa* + *itā* = *cikīrṣ* + *itā*.) It is argued that this rule will undesiredly apply to *a* in *yā*, *vā* also when forms like *yātā*, *vātā* (fut. 3. sing.) are made. Nor will it do, it is further argued, to point to the *t*-suffixion, since it can be shown to have a different purpose (viz. to save the deletion of the whole *ā*), and so it cannot be accepted as a *jñāpaka*. So Pat. brings forward another *jñāpaka* viz. P. 3. 2. 3 : आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः.

This is explained in the *Mbh*. thus : कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम्? कित्करण एतत् प्रयोजनम् — 'किति' इत्याकारलोपो यथा स्यादिति। यद्याकारस्थस्य के ऽकारस्य लोपः स्यात्, कित्करणमनर्थकं स्यात्। परस्याकारस्य लोपे कृते द्वयोरकारयोः पररूपे हि सिद्धं रूपं स्यात्, गोदः कम्बलद इति। पश्यति त्वाचार्यो नाकारस्थस्याकारस्य लोपः स्यादिति। अतः ककारमनुबन्धं करोति।

To explain : P. 3. 2. 3 : आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः is meant to derive forms like *goda* 'one who gives a cow' from *dā* etc. with the addition of the suffix *ka*. The purpose of the code-letter *k* is to secure the elision of *ā* (in *dā*) by P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोप इटि च (*go* + *dā* + *ka* = *go* + *d* + *a*). The opponent of the prohibition says that investing here the suffix *a* with the code-letter *k* will become meaningless if P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः applied to *a* of *yā*, *vā* etc. also,

For, in that case, when the final *a* of *dā* (**daa*) is deleted, the remaining *a* will combine with the suffixal *a* into a single *a* (P. 6. 1. 97 : अतो गुणे), yielding the desired form *goda*. If this form were so available, why should Pāṇ. make the suffix *ka* instead of a simple *a* ? This shows that according to him *a* in *ā* is not elided by P. 6. 4. 48.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 17) अत्राप्यनुबन्धस्य ... निवृत्तिरुच्यते. This is how the *Dīp*. summarizes the *Mbh*. discussoin. If P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः were to apply to *a* in *yātā* etc. then it would apply to *goda* etc. also. Then the code-letter *k* in the suffix *ka* taught by P. 3. 2. 3 will have no scope (*anavakāśa*). So *ā* has to be elided (आकारस्य निवृत्तिरुच्यते) by P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोप इटि च. But this requires an Ārdhadhātuka suffix, *kit* etc. to follow. Hence *kaḥ* (instead of *aḥ*) in P. 3. 2. 3.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 18) अत्र चोद्यते ··· उत्तरार्थमेतत् स्यादिति. This contains an objection (not taken in the *Mbh*.) against the *jñāpaka* character of the *kit* suffix in P. 3. 2. 3 and a reply to it. The objector, the protagonist of prohibition, argues that the code-letter *k* cannot be a *jñāpaka* as it can be explained differently, consistent with the elision of *a* in *ā* by *ato lopaḥ*. If the suffix there is read simply as *a*, there will be a difficulty in arriving at the form *-māya* ' one who throws etc. ' The rule P. 6. 1. 50 : मीनातिमिनोतिदीङां ल्यपि च says that the final of the roots *mīnāti* (i. e. मीञ् हिंसायाम् P. Dh. IX. 4), *minoti* (i. e. डुमिञ् प्रक्षेपणे V. 4) and *dīṅ* (i. e. दीङ् क्षये IV. 26), if it is due to be replaced by *ec* (when Guṇa is possible), is replaced by *ā*. Now, when these roots thus assume the forms *mā* and *dā*, they become subject to P. 3. 2. 3 : आतोऽनुपसर्गे ... in the context *karmaṇy upapade*, *kartari* (*vācye*). If, under these circumstances, Pāṇini had laid down the suffix as merely *a* then, since this *a* can cause a Guṇa of the radical final (e. g. *ī* > *e*, P. 7. 3. 84 : सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः), the radical final is finally to be replaced by *ā* by P. 6. 1. 50. Now, in the position *mā* + *a* there is no possibility of securing a ligature *y* (the *yugāgama*), and consquently the desired form *-māya* cannot be derived. That is why, it is argued, Pāṇ. does not read the suffix as merely *a*, but as *ka*. The code-letter *k* prevents the Guṇa (P. 1. 1. 5 : क्ङिति च). As now there is no possibility of *ĭ* > *e*, the rule 6. 1. 50 does not apply, and the root final *ī* remains intact. The special rule P. 3. 2. 3 does not apply in the absence of a root final *ā* and the general rule P. 3. 2. 1 : *karmaṇy aṇ* applies. Since this *aṇ* can cause Vṛddhi of the radical final (by P. 7. 2. 115 : अचो ञ्णिति), P. 6.1.150 : मीनाति॰ steps in with the result that *mi*/*mī* are replaced by *mā*. With suffix *aṇ* there can now come in the augment *y* (*yuk*; P. 7. 3. 33 : आतो युक् चिण्कृतोः), resulting into the desired form *-māya*. Since the code-letter *k* can be explained on this hypothesis also, it does not necessarily show that the rule अतो लोपः does not apply to *a* of *ā*.

Observation : The MS, which reads here प्रत्यचे (i. e. ये) क्षतानाफगाकरस्वराणा is palpably corrupt. I follow the brilliant suggestion made orally to me by Pt. Bhagavat Shastri and emend the text into प्रत्यये आदन्तानां युगागमकरस्याणोऽप्राप्तिº.

The *Dīp.* नैष दोष: etc. refutes this objection. There will be no difficulty, even in the absence of *k*, in the case of *dī* because it is an intransitive root and as such the context *karmaṇy upapade* is impossible in its case. True, it can be transitive when it is accompanied by a pre-verb, but, according to the very rule, *ka* is to come in only if the root (ending in *ā*) has no preverb. There is also no problem for *mī* and *mi* (both now *mā*), since P. 3. 2. 2 : ह्वावामश्च teaches, by way of exception to P. 3. 2. 3, the suffix *aṇ* to *mā* roots (which, apart from *mā* proper, applies to *mi*, *mī* and *me* by the Pari. [106] गामादाग्रहणेष्वविशेष: ।).

(*p*. 23, *l*. 24) उत्तरार्थमेतत् स्यात्. When it is thus shown that the *jñāpaka* stands, the opponent brings in a new point. He says that even when *a* of *ā* is dropped by *ato lopaḥ* it can be shown that the code-letter *k* has a purpose to serve, if not in this rule, in a subsequent one (*uttarārtham*), viz. 3. 2. 5 : तुन्दशोकयो: परिमृजापनुदो:. He means to say that although the code-letter *k* does not serve any purpose here, still, with the continuation of the suffix in P. 3. 2. 5 it serves to prevent the Guṇa in the roots *pari-mṛj* and *apa-nud*, so that the correct forms are derived, e. g. *tundaparimṛja* 'rubbing one's belly; lazy' and *śokāpanuda* 'dispelling grief'.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 24) एवं तर्हि गापोष्टक् इति. The *Mbh.* actually runs as : यत् तर्हि 'गापोष्टक्' इत्यनन्यार्थं ककारमनुबन्धं करोति. This is the final *jñāpaka* advanced by Pat. As he says, no other purpose (like the preventing of Guṇa) can be attributed (*ananyārtham*) to the furnishing of the code-letter *k* in this rule (3. 2. 8). So it can only be explained on the hypothesis that Pāṇ. does not favour the deleting of *a* in *ā* by the application of his rule *ato lopaḥ* (P. 6. 4. 48). So the suggestion about prohibition made by Kāt. is uncalled for.

(*p*. 23, *l*. 25) तत्रापि पर्यनुयुज्यते ... लोपेन भवितव्यमिति. Here again Bhar. raises a point which was not noticed in the *Mbh.* An objection is raised here in favour of the *pratiṣedha* view. It is argued that even in the case of the rule गापोष्टक् (where Pat. takes the code-letter *k* as *ananyārtha*) a utility can be pointed out so that it ceases to be a *jñāpaka*. The gist of the argument is this : If Pāṇ. had not read the suffix as *ṭak*, but merely as *ṭa*, then there was the danger of deletion of *ā* in *chandogāya*. To prevent this, Pāṇ. adds *k* and reads the suffix as *ṭak*. Since *k* can thus be shown to have a definite purpose, the

opponent's hypothesis, that it is a *jñāpaka* of Pāṇ.'s unexpressed view that the rule *ato lopaḥ* does not apply to *a* of *ā*, cannot be entertained.

The argument is a little bit complicated. It may be presented thus : From *chandas* + *gai* we can derive, by means of the suffix *ṭak* (P. 3. 2. 8), a word *chandoga* in the sense 'one who sings chants'. The Dative sing. of this word is, as everybody knows, *chandogāya*. So far everything is smooth, because Pāṇ. makes the suffix as *ṭak*. But if he had read the suffix as *ṭa* what would happen is this : In the stage *chandas*+*am* (dropped, P. 7. 1. 23 : स्वमोर्नपुंसकात्) +*gā* (< *gai*, P. 6. 1. 45 : आदेच उपदेशेऽशिति) + *ṭa*, the *ā* is no longer dropped (by P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोप इटि च), as the suffix is not *kit*. Instead, it is argued, the final *a* (of *gā* = **gaa*) is dropped by *ato lopaḥ*. After this the remaining *a* and the following suffixal *a* are combined into a single substitute *a* (P. 6. 1. 97 : अतो गुणे), the *pararūpa*. This single substitute, further, can be looked upon, by P. 6. 1. 85 : अन्तादिवच्च, as the final of the preceding. The result of this, combined with the Pari. (37) एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवत् 'what is modified in a part does not (thereby) become something different' is that the resultant *-ga* can be called a *dhātu*. A nominal stem in *a* lengthens (P. 7. 3. 102 : सुपि च) its final *a* to *ā* when *-ya* (<*e*), the ending of Dative sing., follows. The form *chandogāya*, thus formed, now stands in the danger of losing *ā* by P. 6. 4. 140 : आतो धातोः. In order to avoid such an eventuality, Pāṇ. reads the suffix as *ṭak*. Because of this *k*, the root loses its *ā*, so that we again get the form (*chando*)*ga*. Here *-a* is a suffixal part, so that *-ga* has no longer the designation *dhātu* and therefore *ā* is not lost[1]. The opponent's hypothesis that it is a *jñāpaka* for the non-application of P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः need not necessarily be accepted.

न च प्रतिपदोक्तम् ... etc. Here the protagonist of prohibition anticipates an objection from his opponent and replies it. The opponent, who opposes the prohibition, will perhaps take recourse to the Pari. (105) लक्षणप्रतिपदोक्तयोः प्रतिपदोक्तस्यैव ग्रहणम्. He will thus say that the bit *-gā* in *chandogāya* is a result of grammatical operation : elision of the radical *a*, a *pararūpa* and lengthening. It is thus a result of *lakṣaṇa*. It is not a *pratipadokta* form, i. e. the root *gā* (< *gai*) as taught specifically in the text of the Dhātupāṭha. So the rule P.

1. Bhar. gives the argument in a very terse form. For that we are obliged to later commentaries. Read Kaiy. : नन्वसति कित्त्वे आकारस्थस्याकारस्य (= 'उत्तरभागस्य' छाया) लोपे कृते द्वयोरकारयोः पररूपस्य धातुं प्रत्यन्तवद्भावात् 'छन्दोगाय' इत्यत्र 'आतो धातोः' इत्याकारलोपप्रसङ्गः। The *Chāyā* supplies some further details : °**वद्भावादिति**। धात्ववयवत्वे तस्य 'सुपि च' इति दीर्घे कृते तस्यैकदेशविकृतन्यायेन तत्त्वादिति शेषः। कित्त्वे तु 'आतो लोप इटि ...' इत्यालोपेन प्रत्ययाकारस्य तेन दीर्घेऽपि तदप्रसङ्ग इति भावः।

6. 4. 140 : आतो धातोः cannot apply to it. And so it cannot be pleaded that *k* is meant to prevent it. — The protagonist of prohibition replies to this anticipated objection by saying that the Pari. referred to by the opponent is not accepted in this context. If it were accepted, one cannot derive the form *papuṣaḥ* (Acc. pl. of *papivas*, perf. ppl. fr. *pā* ' drink ') resulting from *papā* (> *pap*, P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोपः etc.) +*vas* (>*uṣ*, P. 6. 4. 131 : वसोः संप्रसारणम्) +*śas*. For, here *papā* is a *lakṣaṇokta* form whereas the *pratipadokta* form is *pā*. If the Pari. is applied here *ā* of *papā* cannot be deleted for the absence of the status of Dhātu. And surely the opponent also will not like this. Just as the application of the Pari. is not desired in the case of *papuṣaḥ*, it is also not desired in the case of *chandogāya*. The objection is overruled.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 1) संनिपातलक्षणे ... न स्यात्. Another objection, anticipated and overruled. This is the objection : the deletion of *ā* in *chandogāya* will be prohibited by the *saṁnipāta* dictum. The Pari. (85) संनिपातलक्षणो विधिरनिमित्तं तद्विघातस्य says that a rule (or operation) which is occasioned by a particular combination does not destroy that combination, i. e. does not cause the application of another rule which would destroy that combination. In the present case *ā* (the result of lengthening) comes in by reason of the combination stem-final *a*+*ya*. This *ā* is a *saṁnipātalakṣana* operation. So it cannot allow another rule viz. P. 6. 4. 140 : आतो धातोः to take advantage of this *ā* and delete it as the destruction of the combination is not desired.

संनिपातलक्षणे यकारे तु आकार एव न स्यात्. This is the reply to the objection anticipated above. He says that if you bring in the *saṁnipāta* Pari., it will land you in a further difficulty. You are trying to save the elision of *ā* on the basis of the *saṁnipāta* Pari. But, pray tell me, how does *ā* come in in the first instance itself ? To explain. In the present case the substitute -*ya* for -*ṅe* (P. 7. 1. 13 : ङेर्यः) comes in by reason of the combination viz. a stem in *a*+*ṅe*. Now this -*ya*, which owes its existence to this combination, cannot become a cause of distruction of that combination by allowing P. 7. 3. 102 : सुपि च to operate, which would lengthen the stem final *a* and thus destroy that combination. So the *saṁnipāta* argument proves nothing. — (*p.* 24, *l.* 1) उच्यते । आत्वेनालोप ... भवितव्यमिति । This is the final observation of the *Dīp.* on the point under discussion. There is a twofold difficulty about this passage. Firstly, the MS is evidently corrupt. Secondly, even with some reconstruction of the text, the import of the passage remains uncertain. The MS actually reads : उच्यते । आतानालोप इति य एव तदेवं ... Following a suggestion of Pt. Bhagavat Shastri, I now reconstruct the text as उच्यते । ' आतोऽनापः ' इत्येव तत् । एवं ... (translated accordingly, *p.* 72, *l.* 28). Here आतोऽनापः is *Vār.* 1 on P. 6. 4. 140 : आतो धातो. The *Vār.* seeks to replace धातोः by अनापः. After this replacement, the rule would apply to a

nominal stem excepting the one ending in *āp*, even if the designation *dhātu* is not there. The modified rule is meant to account for forms like *ktvaḥ* (<*ktvā* + *ṅas*), cf. P. 7. 1. 37 : समासेऽनञ्पूर्वे क्त्वो ल्यप्. But once this modification is accepted, Bhar. argues now, the rule will undesiredly apply not to forms like *chandogāya* alone, but to *all* Dat. sing. of *a*-stems like *rāmāya* etc. for example, demanding deletion of the stem-final *ā* (एवं सति सर्वथा लोपेन भवितव्यम्).

Observation : If our emended text and its interpretation as given above be accepted, it would seem that the opponent of prohibition has not given his clear defence against the argument of the opponent. What he has done is to show that with Kāt.'s modification the problem is no longer limited to nominal stems which retain the designation of *dhātu*; it is now extended to the Dat. sing. of *all a*-stems. It is as much a problem to the opponent as to himself. So it is not proper to blame him. It is as much a duty of the other man to find out some solution of the problem.

So it would seem that Bhar., who does not refer to the non-obligatory nature of the *saṁnipāta* Pari., has kept the problem open. Others, however, refuse to look upon the Pari. as obligatory. They resort to it where convenient, but throw it away when it is inconvenient. It is invoked to prevent the deletion of *ā*. But it is discarded as *anitya* when the production of *ā* itself is to be justified. And a clue to it is seen in Pāṇ.'s usage *kaṣṭāya* (in P. 3. 1. 14 : कष्टाय क्रमणे). Read Kaiy. : 'ननु ... छन्दोगायेत्यत्र 'आतो धातोः' इत्यकारलोपप्रसङ्गः। नैष दोषः। संनिपातपरिभाषया लोपो न भविष्यति। अकारं ह्याश्रित्य यशब्दः कृतो लोपस्यानिमित्तम्। दीर्घत्वं तु 'कष्टाय' इति निपातनाद्भवति. This is also the view of other authorities like the *Kāś.*, the *Sid-Kau.* etc. Lastly the *Mbh.* on P. 1. 1. 39 : कृन्मेजन्तः (I. 100. 3-4), which discusses the pros and cons of this Pari. (but does not specifically mention the present case) concludes thus : तस्माद्यान्यस्याः परिभाषायाः प्रयोजनानि तदर्थमेषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या, प्रतिविधेयं दोषेषु. Although not mentioned in the *Mbh.*, our case is referred to by Kaiy. who remarks here also : 'कष्टाय' इति ज्ञापकाद्यशब्दे दीर्घो भविष्यति। Kaiy. has added this new case in spite of the explicit statement in the *Mbh.* : दोषाः खल्वपि साकल्येन परिगणिताः. Nāg., who always thinks that he is in duty bound to defend Pat. at all costs, here goes to the extreme when be observes : कष्टायेति। ... न चैवं 'दोषाः ... साकल्येन' इति भाष्यविरोधः। 'कष्टायेति यादेशो दीर्घत्वस्य' इति ग्रन्थो भाष्यपुस्तकेषु भ्रष्टोऽतो न दोषः !

Readings : (1) (*p.* 23, *l.* 16) MSSw दोर्घो न. — (2) (*p.* 23, *l*, 17) MS AL अनुबंधत्वासंगो. — (3) (*p.* 23, *l.* 21) MSSw क्षतानाफगाकरस्वराणा अप्राप्त°; AL कित्त्वयुडागमस्वराणामप्राप्ति°. — (4) (*p.* 23, *l.* 24) Ed. यत्तर्हि. — (5) (*p.* 23 *l.* 26) MSSw पप्लव (for पपुष). — (6) (*p.* 24, *l.* 1) MS Sw पकारे तुकार; AL वकारे उकार (for यकारे तु आकार). — (7) (*p.* 24, *ll.* 1-2) MS Sw आतानालोप इति य एव तदेवं (for आत्वेनालोप इति लोप एव। तदेवं).

[4. 2]

एकवर्णवच्च. Another observation of Kāt. The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* runs as follows : एकवर्णवच्च दीर्घो भवतीति वक्तव्यम् । किं प्रयोजनम् ? वाचा तरतीति ह्यज्लक्षणष्ठन् मा भूदिति । इह वाचो निमित्तं "तस्य निमित्तं संयोगोत्पातौ" इत्यनुवर्तमाने 'गोद्व्यचः' इति ह्यज्लक्षणो यन् मा भूदिति । This is the point involved : A long vowel can be said to consist of two short vowels (e. g. *vāc*=**vaac*). If both the short vowels are understood separately, and the rules otherwise applicable to short vowels apply to them also, then the word *vāc* will have to be deemed as having two vowels (*dvyac*), and consequently P. 4. 4. 7 : नौद्व्यचष्ठन् will wrongly apply to *vāc* which, with the affixion of the suffix *ṭhan*=*ika* will result in the undesired form **vācika* in the sense of 'one who swims or crosses over by speech' (वाचा तरतीति). Similarly, with a wrong application of P. 5. 1. 39 : गोद्व्यचोऽसंख्या ... a word *vācya* will undesiredly result from *vāc*+*yat* in the sense of 'a union or a natural portent which is a cause of speech'. To prevent such wrong applications of rules, a rule declaring that the two parts are treated as a single vowel (एकवर्णवत्) will have to be made, if one subscribes to the view : वर्णैकदेशानामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं भवति.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 3) संख्या निवर्तिका etc. In the case of the word *vāc* the natural (*prākṛta*) number of vowels (*ac*) in it is one. On the view that the parts of a phoneme behave like their independent counterparts the number will be two. This new or later number (two) will set aside the earlier number (one), since *saṁkhyā nivartikā sarvatra*. The new number will still be a natural (*prākṛta*) one, in the sense that it is not imposed by grammar. The grammar extends (*atideśa*) the status of a single vowel-phoneme, so that the undesired *dvyactva* should go.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 5) 'सावेकाचः' इति क स्यात्. A sort of objection against the necessity of the *Vār.* The rule P. 6. 1. 168 : सावेकाचस्तृतीयादिर्विभक्तिः says that in the case of a nominal stem which is monosyllabic before the ending *-su* (of Loc. pl.), the case-endings from Instr. sing. onwards have the Udātta accent. Now if all monosyllabic stems with a long vowel were looked upon as dissyllabic vowels, where will P. 6. 1. 168, which applies to monosyllabic stems, find a scope ? If that rule is not to become meaningless, the view वर्णैकदेशानामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं भवति is to be rejected. If it is to be rejected, there is no use of the *Vār.* एकवर्णवच्च. The opponent suggests that this question is rather naive. All monosyllabic stems do not have a long vowel. There are those with a short vowel, like *sruc*, *tvac* etc. where P. 6. 1. 168 will find its scope. So, on the view that वर्णैकदेशानामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं भवति, which can still stand, the *Vār.* is necessary for stems like *vāc*.

(*p*. 24, *l*. 5) अथ वा, गोनौग्रहणं etc. Here the *Dīp*. introduces the argument of the *Mbh*. that the inclusion of the word *go* in P. 5. 1. 39 : गोद्व्यचोऽसंख्या. etc. and of *nau* in P. 4. 4. 7 : नौद्व्यचष्ठन् will be a *jñāpaka* which will indicate that even on the view: वर्णैकदेशानामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं भवति, the undesired results, viz. the word *vāc* getting the suffixes *ṭhan* and *yat* (see above!) will not follow. So the *Vār*. is superfluous.

The argument is clear. If Pāṇ. wanted his rules 5. 1. 39 and 4. 4. 7, which concern *dvyac* words, to apply to monosyllabic stems with long vowels (*vāc* e. g.), there was no reason why he should have read *go* and *nau* in these two rules. The mere mention of *dvyac* should have sufficed for these two words also. The very fact that he read them expressly, shows that the rules meant for long vowels do not apply to their short components.

The last sentence (सामान्यविषयं etc.) is rather confusing. According to the idiom of Sanskrit, the expression सामान्यविषयम् is expected to be the subject (*uddeśya*). But it is apparently the predicate (*vidheya*), with सर्वविषयम् in apposition with it. I take the sentence to mean that the parts are not recognized separately, not only in the case of Taddhita suffixes based on the number of syllables in a stem, but in the context of any operation concerning a long vowel. Kaiy. however, expands the scope still wider. Read : सामान्येन ज्ञापकं वर्णावयवाश्रयकार्याभावस्य । तेन अम्र एहि इत्यादौ 'एङः पदान्तादति' इत्यादि न भवति ।

Readings : (1) (*p*. 24, *l*. 3) MSSw निर्वर्तिका. — (2) (*p*. 24, *l*. 4) The MS reads व्यपदिश्यते, which is retained in the eds. But perhaps °दिश्येत would be more appropriate. — (3) AL एतत्तु (for एतु as in the MS). — (4) (*p*. 24, *l*. 5) The MS (and, following it the eds.) reads अथ वा after द्व्यच्त्वमिति. But it makes no sense there. The sentence सावेकाचः etc. which follows does not contain an alternative. The alternative is given in the *pratīka* गोनौग्रहणम्. So I have shifted अथ वा to after त्वचेति and before गोनौ°. — (5) (*p*. 24, *l*. 5) Sw के वा (for स्रुचा).

[4. 3]

नाव्यपवृक्तस्यावयवे etc. (*Vār*. 9). The whole *Vār*. runs as : नाव्यपवृक्तस्यावयवे तद्विधिर्यथा द्रव्येषु. The *Mbh*. reads : नाव्यपवृक्तस्यावयवस्य तदाश्रितो विधिर्भवति, यथा द्रव्येषु । तद्यथा 'सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो भवन्ति' इति न सप्तदशारत्निमात्रं काष्ठमग्नावभ्याधीयते। This is a *samādhāna-vārttika*, i. e. it is a *Vār*. which replies the objections raised in the previous *Vār*-s. It refutes the two previous *Vār*-s (दीर्घे ह्रस्व° etc. and एकवर्णवच्च) on the ground that where parts of an integrated whole are not felt separately, they are not subject to the operations taught for their independent counterparts. This is supported by citing a worldly parallel

अव्यपवृक्तस्य, 'not separate' i. e. what is not felt or experienced as separate, what is an integrated whole. This is an attribute of a substantive समुदायस्य (understood). Even with the v. l. अवयवस्य (for अवयवे) which is seen in the Nirn. ed., the word is still taken as referring to a whole, the two Genitives अव्यपवृक्तस्य and अवयवस्य being understood as *vyadhikaraṇa*. व्यपवृक्तम् = व्यपवर्गः or भेदः as Kaiy. says. He further explains अव्यपवृक्तस्य by अभिन्नबुद्धिविषयस्य, एकत्वालम्बनज्ञानग्राह्यस्य (समुदायस्य). तद्विधिः = पृथग्भूत-वर्णविधिः (Kaiy.), cf. पृथग्भूते यो विधिर्दिष्टः सः (*Dīp.*). Bhar. also notes the other reading अवयवस्य and explains it. Hence the *Dīp.* : अथ वा, अपवृक्तस्य योऽवयवस्तस्य etc. He, however, does not say expressly that he is dealing with a *v. l.* The following part of the *Dīp.*, viz. अपृथग्भूतस्य अवयवे पृथग्भूते is common to both the readings. Nāg. explains अवयवाश्रयः (*Mbh.*) by अवयवसदृशस्वतन्त्रवर्णाश्रयः.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 10) सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो भवन्ति etc. This illustrates the यथा द्रव्येषु of the *Vār.* The parallel is taken from ritual. According to the injunction सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो भवन्ति (*Taitt. Saṁ.* 2. 5. 7) seventeen faggots are to be placed on the altar. (The word *sāmidhenī*, as the *Dīp.* points out, originally means a *ṛc* to be recited when the faggots are placed on the altar, but, by association, the word comes to mean faggots also.) Now, instead of placing seventeen faggots, if one were to place a seventeen-cubit long stick, will it do? No. The seventeen divisions in the stick, each one cubit long, cannot be recognized separately as seventeen different faggots. The stick continues to have the number one, undislodged by the number seventeen. So the injunction सप्तदश सामिधेन्यो भवन्ति is not then satisfied. Just as the parts here, which have no separate identity, are not recognized separately, so also the parts of phonemes which are not felt to be separate. Similarly Kaiy. : सामिधेनीशब्द ऋचां वाचकः साहचर्यात् काष्ठेषु वर्तते। तत्र सप्तदशहस्ते काष्ठे सप्तदश काष्ठानि इति बुद्धेरभावान्न तस्याभ्याधानम्।

(*p.* 24, *l.* 13) प्रत्यृचं चैव हि तत् कर्म चोद्यते etc. This is the *dṛṣṭānta-vaiṣamyabhāṣya* (cf. the words विषम उपन्यासः which precede). The opponent says that if a single stick of wood 17 cubits long is not placed on the altar, it is because 17 placings of the faggots are to be accompanied by 17 *ṛc*-s. Each placing of the faggot is accompanied by the recitation of its *ṛc*. This is the reason. It cannot justify the view of the opponent, viz. वर्णैकदेशानामवयवग्रहणेन ग्रहणं न भवति.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 14) अथैतत् स्यात् ... उच्चारयात्विति. This supplies the background for the *Mbh.* which immediately follows, viz. असंभवश्चाग्नौ वेद्यां च. This is the idea : Perhaps the protagonist of the *Vār.* नाव्यपवृक्तस्या ... द्रव्येषु will say that it is possible to place the whole seventeen-cubit long stick on fire (possibly seventeen times) and recite one *ṛc* after another. But it is not done because नाव्यपवृक्तस्या ... तद्विधिः. This *Mbh.* points out that this argument is wrong,

It is impossible to place such a long stick on the sacrificial fire since the altar is small for it (only 3½ cubits, as the commentators point out). Further, Nāg. points out pertinently that what is once offered in the sacrificial fire cannot be taken back : आहितपुनर्ग्रहणस्य निषिद्धत्वादेकस्य काष्ठस्य प्रत्यृचमाधानं न संभवतीति भावः... समिधोऽग्नेर्वेदिबहिर्भावनिषेधाच्चासंभव इति भावः। He brings out the purpose of the *Mbh.* tersely thus : न ह्यव्यपवृक्तत्वमात्रनिबन्धनं तदनभ्याधानं किं तु तदसंभवनिबन्धनम् ....

(*p.* 24, *l.* 15) अर्धचतुर्थहस्ता = अर्धेन ऊनः चतुर्थो हस्तो यस्याः '3½ cubits in length'. Kaiy. in some Nirn. eds. reads in an identical passage अर्धचतुर्हस्ता, which is explained as अर्धेन चतुर्हस्तेति तृतीयातत्पुरुषः by Nāg. अर्धचतुर्हस्ता is accepted here in *Dīp.* also by Sw, probably under the influence of Kaiy. and Nāg.

(*p.* 24 *l.* 17) यथा तर्हि etc. The full text of this *Mbh.* is : यथा तर्हि 'सप्तदश प्रादेशमात्रीराश्वत्थीः समिधोऽभ्यादधीत' इति न सप्तदशप्रादेशमात्रं काष्ठमग्नावभ्याधीयते. This variation (from सप्तदशारत्निमात्रं काष्ठम् in the case of the *sāmidhenī*-s) is just to suggest that here the Aśvattha faggots being of a smaller size (प्रादेश = 'span'), the argument of *asaṁbhava* cannot be brought in now by the opponent (अल्पप्रमाणत्वाच्च स्यात् संभवः). Another difference pointed out by the *Dīp.* is that no *ṛc* is to accompany the placing of the Aśvattha faggot (नात्र ऋक्संबन्धात् समिच्छब्दो ...).

(*p.* 24, *l.* 17) अत्रापि प्रतिप्रणवम् इति. The complete *Mbh.* sentence runs as : अत्रापि प्रतिप्रणवं चैतत् कर्म चोद्यते। तुल्यश्चासंभवोऽग्नौ वेद्यां च। If it is not *ṛc* this time, it is *praṇava*. The utterance of *om* is to accompany now. Besides a *prādeśa* may be shorter than an *aratni*, still the altar cannot contain a seventeen *prādeśa*-s long stick. Hence the *Dīp.* : पूर्ववदेव.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 17) यथा तर्हि घृतं तैलमिति. The full text of the *Mbh.* runs thus : यथा तर्हि तैलं न विक्रेतव्यम्, मांसं[1] न विक्रेतव्यम् इति व्यपवृक्तं च न विक्रीयते, अव्यपवृक्तं गावः सर्षपाश्च विक्रीयन्ते. The prohibition to sell oil or flesh applies to extracted oil and flesh separated from the body of an animal. It does not apply to mustard seeds (although they contain oil) and cows or bulls (although they contain flesh). Parts cannot behave as wholes. Moral : one cannot decide on the basis of mere possibility. Separate perception, or feeling of separateness, is necessary if parts are to behave independently.

The *Dīp.* सत्यपि घृततैलसंभवे ... विक्रयो भवति explains the same point (न संभवमात्रात् प्रतिपत्तिर्युक्ता). But unfortunately here the text is corrupt and does not much help even after reconstruction. The MS actually reads : सत्यपि घृततैलसंभवे घृतरूपस्य गोशब्देनाभिधानात्। तैलरूपेण संस्पर्शरूपशिष्टेनाविक्रयो भवति. I follow AL in emending तैलरूपेण संस्पर्शरूपशिष्टेनाविक्रयो into तैलरूपस्य सर्षपशब्देन विक्रयो.

1. Bhar. reads घृतं (for मांसं) in the *Mbh.*

Only I make a further emendation; I read [अ]नभिधानात् and also insert this word after सर्षपशब्देन for the sake of symmetry. And I also add a च after तैल-रूपस्य. But even after all this elaborate emendation, the text which results is not very satisfactory. The *Dīp.* seems to say that although oil may be there in the mustard seed, it does not form a part of the meaning of the word *sarṣapa*; similarly flesh (or ghee) of the word *go*. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no bar to the selling of cows and mustard seeds. — I do not follow the argument. It would have been easy to understand if the *Dīp.* had said: *घृतशब्देन गोरूपस्यानभिधानात्, तैलशब्देन च सर्षपरूपस्यानभिधानात् ... ('the prohibition of selling *ghṛta* (or *māṁsa*) does not apply to the sale of a cow, because a cow is not denoted by the word *ghṛta* (or *māṁsa*). Similarly the prohibition of selling oil does not apply to the sale of mustard seeds, because mustard seeds are not denoted by the word *taila*'). I also do not see the exact propriety of *-rūpa* in *ghṛtarūpasya* and *tailarūpasya*. Kaiy. observes: न हि संभवमात्रेण कार्याणि क्रियन्ते, अपि तु यत्र तद्बुद्धिरस्ति तत्रैव.

(*p*. 24, *l*. 20) एष तु न्यायो विरुध्यते etc. Bhar. points out that the view नाव्यपवृक्तस्य ... as illustrated by अव्यपवृक्तं गावः सर्षपाश्च विक्रीयन्ते violates the maxim माषा न भोक्तव्याः. It means '*māṣa* (beans) shall not be eaten'. It prohibits not only eating of pure beans, but even of mixed dishes containing beans. The maxim नाव्यपवृक्तस्य runs counter to it. Kaiy. says that the prohibition माषा न भोक्तव्याः applies to a mixed dish also because of the *tadbuddhi* (and the consequent desire to eat it). Read: 'माषा न भोक्तव्याः' इति निषेधस्तु मिश्रेष्वपि वर्तते, तत्र तद्बुद्धितद्रसास्वादनसंभवात्.

अनेन (*l*. 21), strictly 'by this one', simply means 'by one' ('one does not eat a mixed dish containing beans'). For such a use, cf. the *Mbh.* usages like: शक्यं चानेन शालिमांसादीन्यपि व्रतयितुम् (*Mbh.* I. 8. 15), मृजिरस्मा अविशेषेणोपदिष्टः (I. 41. 2) etc.

(*p*. 24, *l*. 23) यत्र तर्हि व्यपवर्गो दृश्यते etc. The full text of the *Mbh.* is as follows: यत्र तर्हि व्यपवर्गोऽस्ति ? क्व च व्यपवर्गोऽस्ति ? संध्यक्षरेषु । The idea is: It's all right that the rules applying to independent vowels will not apply to their counterparts which form parts of complex vowels, where they are not separately visible. But what, where separateness of parts is clearly visible, e. g. in diphthongs *ai*, *au*? Kaiy. merely says: ऐ औ इत्यत्र हि स्फुटोऽकारप्रतिभासोऽस्ति. Bhar. gives the rationale behind it in the *Dīp.*: संध्यक्षरेषु प्रयत्नस्य विरामोपादानाभ्यां लक्ष्यः पृथग्भाव इति. In uttering *ai* for instance, the speech organs first form a particular position suitable for the utterance of *a*, and the breath is expelled. With this, one effort (or the activity) is over (*virāma*). Then a second effort begins (*upādāna*) with which another position, suitable for the utterance of *i*, is assumed by the speech organs and again the breath is expelled. The *Dīp.* says

that this ceasing of the first effort and the commencing of another make the separateness clear.

(*p*. 24, *l*. 26) संध्यक्षरेषु विवृततत्वात्. The *Mbh*. on this *Vār*. runs as follows: यदत्रावर्णम्, विवृततरं तदन्यस्मादवर्णात्। ये अपीवर्णोवर्णे, विवृततरे ते अन्याभ्यामिवर्णोवर्णाभ्याम्। The *Vār*. argues that the constituents of a diphthong (e. g. *a* and *i* of *e*, *ai*), are more open (*vivṛta* = *vivṛtatara*) than ordinary, independent *a* and *i*. Since there is *prayatnabheda* there is no *sāvarṇya* (प्रयत्नभेदात् सावर्ण्यं नास्ति). When there is no *sāvarṇya* how can there be *grahaṇa* (कुतो ग्रहणम्) ? So the upshot is that in the case of speech sounds where there is a clear perception of separateness (*vyapavarga*), there is no danger of wrong application of rules, resulting into wrong forms.

Readings: (1) (*p*. 24, *ll*. 7-8) Sw °क्तं यस्मिन्. — (2) (*p*. 24, *l*. 9) MS [अ]पृक्त-; Sw [अ]वृक्त- (for [अ]पृथग्). — (3) (*p*. 24, *l*. 10) AL ऋक्षु प्रयुक्तः; Sw (unnecessarily) ऋचां वाचकः. — (4) (*p*. 24, *l*. 13) MS Sw उपा(MS, sec. m. adds या); AL उपादेया (for अपि). — (5) (*p*. 24, *l*. 14) MS AL Sw [अ]स्याध्यायकृय(AL °त्य) (for [अ]स्याधाय ऋच). — (6) (*p*. 24, *l*. 15) Sw (unnecessarily) -चतुर्हस्ता. — (7) (*p*. 24, *l*. 17) The MS घृतं तैलं suggests that Bhar. must have read the *Mbh*. as घृतं न विक्रेतव्यं तैलं न विक्रेतव्यम्[1] (for the Ed. तैलं न विक्रेतव्यं मांसं न विक्रेतव्यम्). — (8) (*p*. 24, *ll*. 18-19) MSALSw गोशब्देनाभि°. MS Sw तैलरूपेण संस्पर्शरूपशि(Sw [वि]शि)ष्टेनावि°; AL तैलरूपस्य सर्षपशब्देन वि°. — (9) (*p*. 24, *l*. 20) MS एथर्हि; AL Sw एवं तर्हि (for एवं हि). — (10) (*p*. 24, *l*. 21) MS Sw °पेत्येति. — (11) (*p*. 24, *l*. 23) *Mbh*. Ed. अस्ति (for दृश्यते). — (12) (*p*. 24, *l*. 24) MS पापरादिषु; ALSw ए(Sw ऐ)कारादिषु (for अपवरकादिषु).

[5]

(*p*. 25, *l*. 1) अथ वा पुनर्न गृह्यन्ते. Kāt. and Pat. now take up the opposite view for discussion. In the *Dīp*. इदमुक्तम् etc., Bhar. takes stock of the arguments presented so far in favour of ग्रहणपक्ष. Similarly Kaiy. Read: तत्र प्रयत्नभेदादसावर्ण्यादकारेण संध्यक्षरावयवस्य ग्रहणं नास्तीत्यर्थः। तदेवमाकारादिस्थस्यावयवस्य भेदेनाग्रहणादग्रहणम्। संध्यक्षरस्य त्वसावर्ण्यात्। ऋकारस्थस्तु रेफो भेदेन प्रतिभासाद् गृह्यते इति नुडादिसिद्धिः।

(*p*. 25, *l*. 3) तत्र वाक्यकारस्येदं दर्शनम् etc. Bhar. here gives a reason to justify the view: अथ वा पुनर्न गृह्यन्ते. The reason for non-comprehension is that the so-called parts simply do not exist (नैवावयवौ स्तः). What look like parts (say *a* and *i* in *ai*) are merely similar to some simple vowels (*a* and *i*,) and not identical with them. The identification, based on similarity of form, is just

1. Or, as तैलं न विक्रेतव्यं घृतं न विक्रेतव्यम्, if the transposition घृतं तैलं is inadvertent.

an illusion. The compound vowel (whether a diphthong, or, according to ancient Sanskrit grammarians, the speech sounds ṛ, ḷ) belongs to an altogether different category (समुदाय एव स जात्यन्तरयुक्तो). It is like *Nara-Siṁha,* which is a different species altogether. You do not say — or it is not correct to say — that Narasiṁha has some limbs of man and some of lion. Similar is the case with the *samudāya* vowels. (Bhar. gave this reason, and the particular parallel of Nara-Siṁha earlier also [*p.* 22, *ll.* 19–22], while commenting on the *Mbh.*: अभ्यन्तरश्च समुदायेऽवयवः which he introduced with the remark: संप्रत्ययग्रहणे हेतुरुच्यते.) Following him Kaiy. also observes: नरसिंहवद् वर्णान्तरत्वात्, सादृश्याच्च प्रत्यभिज्ञानात् तत्त्वासिद्ध्या पृथगुपलब्धानां वर्णानां समुदाये नास्ति सत्त्वम्। समुदायवाचोयुक्तिरपि तत्र वर्णान्तरे न तात्त्विकी, भ्रान्तिवशात् त्ववयवसद्भावाश्रयेण प्रवृत्ता। Nāg. elucidates further Kaiy's argument and finally concludes: एवं च भ्रान्तिरेव ग्रहणपक्षे बीजमिति भावः।

Observation: The doctrine that the compound phonemes like diphthongs or ṛ, ḷ are indivisible wholes, that they have no parts, and that the identification of what look like parts is purely an illusion is attributed by Bhar. to Kāty., the author of the Vārttikas. Actually Kāty. has said no such thing. He has simply considered pros and cons of both the *grahaṇa* and the *agrahaṇa* view, i. e. he has pointed out the defects of both the views and has also recommended measures in order to avoid wrong application of rules resulting into wrong forms. He does not express himself in favour of either view, nor does he specifically say, though Bhar. says he does, that there is no *grahaṇa* of the parts because they do not exist. It seems to be Bhar.'s own view, but it is possible that he had inherited the doctrine from the tradition and sincerely believed that Kāty. must have held it. Actually, the doctrine does not seem to have a support in the *Mbh.* also.

[5. 1]

(*p.* 25, *l.* 5) नुड्विधिलादेशविनामेषु. The full *Vārt.* runs as: अग्रहणं चेन्नुड्विधिलादेशविनामेष्वृकारग्रहणम्. The *Mbh.* on this: अग्रहणं चेन्नुड्विधिलादेशविनामेष्वृकारग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। 'तस्मान्नुड् द्विहलः' 'ऋकारे च' इति वक्तव्यम्। इहापि यथा स्यात् — आनृधतुः, आनृधुरिति। यस्य पुनर्गृह्यन्ते, 'द्विहलः' इत्येव तस्य सिद्धम्॥ यस्यापि न गृह्यन्ते तस्याप्येष न दोषः। द्विहल्ग्रहणं न करिष्यते। तस्मान्नुड् भवतीत्येव॥ यदि न क्रियते, आटतुः, आटुरित्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति॥ अश्नोतिग्रहणं नियमार्थं भविष्यति — अश्नोतेरेवावर्णोपधस्य, नान्यस्यावर्णोपधस्येति॥

The *Vār.* mentions three grammatical operations in connection with which an additional rule mentioning ṛ (in a suitable case) will have to be made since, on the *agrahaṇa* view, the consonantal *r* can no longer represent *r* which is a part of ṛ. The three operations are: (1) नुड्विधिः — the augment *nuṭ* (= a prefixed *n*) taught for a root having two consonants (by P. 7. 4. 71;

तस्मान्नुड् द्विहल:) after the radical *a* is lengthened (e. g. *ānaṅga*, 3. sing. Perf. *parasmai*° fr. *aṅg*-). (2) लादेश: — the substitution of *l* in the place of *r* in the form of *kṛp* (P. 8. 2. 18 : कृपो रो ल:). (3) विनाम: — the cerebralization of *n* into *ṇ* (P. 8. 4. 1 : रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे).

अथावयवा: सन्ति etc. Before commenting upon the discussions in the *Mbh.* on this *Vār*. Bhar. introduces a general objection against the *Vār*. The objector takes his stand on the other view viz. वर्णैकदेशानां वर्णग्रहणेन ग्रहणं भवति· (But is this not rather unusual ? This view is already discussed and closed.) He brings in the old arguments. He says that *if* (अथ) parts are there (i. e. if they are recognized) then they may not be active when an operation is taught for the whole as such (e. g. *e* > *ay* before vowels) ; but if it is taught for the parts as such, there is no reason why the parts should not participate in it. And *nuṭ* etc. involved here *are* such operations. So *nuṭ* etc. will be available automatically. The additional rule suggested by the *Vār*. is superfluous (नार्थ ऋकारग्रहणेन)·

(*p*. 25, *l*. 9) यद्येवं तुक्यपि etc. A counter-objection and a reply to it. Both are just a repetition of the arguments which have already appeared in the sections which have preceded.

(*p*. 25, *l*. 11) अश्नोतेरेवावर्णोपधस्य. This occurs in the *Mbh.* (quoted above) in connection with the augment *nuṭ*. The Perf. forms like *ānṛdhatuḥ*, *ānṛdhuḥ* are in question. The process of arriving at them is like this :

ऋध् + लिट्

ऋध् + अतुस् (No पुगन्तलघूपधगुण because of P. 1. 2. 5 : असंयोगाल्लिट् कित्)

ऋध् + ऋध् + अतुस् (P. 6. 1. 8 : लिटि धातोरनभ्यासस्य)

अर्ध् + ऋध् + अतुस् (P. 7. 4. 66 : उरत् ; 1. 1. 51 : उरण् रपर:)

अ + ऋध् + अतुस् (P. 7. 4. 60 : हलादि: शेष:)

आ + ऋध् + अतुस् (P. 7. 4. 70 : अत आदे:)

आ + न् + ऋध् + अतुस् (P. 7. 4. 71 : तस्मान्नुड द्विहल:)

Here the *Mbh.* explains that the rule P. 7. 4. 71 : तस्मान्नुड् ... requires a root to consist of two consonants (*dvihal*) in order to qualify itself for *nuṭ*. There is no difficulty on the *grahaṇa* view, because *r* which is contained in *ṛ* can be counted as a consonant, so that with *dh* as the other one, the condition of having two consonants is fulfilled. But on the *agrahaṇa* view there is no such facility. P. 7. 4. 71 cannot apply as the *dvihal* condition is not satisfied. So an additional rule : *ṛkāre ca* ' also when *ṛ* is there (in the root) ' will have to be made.

At this stage the opponent, the *agrahaṇavādin*, makes a novel suggestion. He would like to delete the word *dvihalaḥ* from the rule altogether. So now any root, with *a* lengthened to *ā* in the reduplication, will have *nuṭ*, *dvihal* or not. *ānṛdhatuḥ* is secured even without the proposed additional rule. But will not such a procedure open the flood-gates and admit *nuṭ* even in forms like *āṭatuḥ*, *āṭuḥ* where it is not desired ? No. How ? How do you prevent it ? The following (7. 4. 72) rule : अश्नोतेश्च will take care of it. This rule is framed so as to secure *nuṭ* for *aś-* because otherwise P. 7. 4. 41 is not applicable to it as it is not *dvihal*. But once *dvihalaḥ* is removed from it, the rule अश्नोतेश्च is no longer necessary. Still we retain it, for then it can serve as a *niyama* (a restrictive rule). The restriction will be like this : If a root with *a* as the penultimate is to have *nuṭ*, it will be *aś* only and not any other one, say *aṭ* (अश्नोतेरेवावर्णोपधस्य, नान्यस्यावर्णोपधस्येति).

एवमनुमानं कल्पते etc. The *anumāna* (i. e. the *jñāpaka*) : अश्नोतेरेवावर्णोपधस्य is challenged and confirmed. It is suggested that the rule अश्नोतेश्च, retained even after deleting *dvihalaḥ*, could lead to an equally reasonable another inference, viz. that *aśnoti* (Cl. V) alone gets the *nuṭ* and not *aśnāti* (Cl. IX). When the maxim सिद्धे सति पुनर्ग्रहणं नियमार्थम् is satisfied by restricting *nuṭ* to *aśnu-*, precluding it from *aśnā-* (अश्नोतेरेव कथं स्याद् अश्नातेर्मा भूत्), where is the need to run all the way to all roots (with a penultimate *a*) ? The *Dīp.* merely says that the original reasoning alone is correct. Surprisingly, it does not give any reason why the other inference is not correct. We find the reason given by Nāg. in his comm. on *Prad.* He says that if the prohibition of *nuṭ* for *aśnā-* alone were intended, Pāṇini would have read the rule as नाश्नः. Read : ननु विकरणविशेषनिर्देशेन श्नाविकरणनिवृत्त्यर्थं सूत्रं स्यादत आह — न त्वश्नातेरेवेति । तथा हि सति 'नाश्न' इत्येव वदेदिति भावः ।

(*p.* 25, *l.* 13) अविभक्तिको निर्देशः etc. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* concerns the second operation, viz. *lādeśa*. It runs thus : लादेशे च ऋकारग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। 'कृपो रो लः' — ऋकारस्य चेति वक्तव्यम्। इहापि यथा स्यात्, क्लृप्तः, क्लृप्तवानिति। यस्य पुनर्गृह्यन्ते, 'रः' इत्येव तस्य सिद्धम्॥ यस्यापि न गृह्यन्ते, तस्यापि न दोषः। ऋकारोऽप्यत्र निर्दिश्यते। कथम्? अविभक्तिको निर्देशः — कृप उः रः लः = 'कृपो रो लः'.

This is the problem : Pāṇ. reads the root *klp* as *kṛp*(*ū*) (I. 799) and frames a rule : कृपो रो लः (8. 2. 18) teaching substitution of *l* in the place of *r* in the full forms. As a result we have forms like *kalpate*, *klṛpta* from (the theoretical) *karpate*, *kṛpta* etc. In this process, not only the consonantal *r*, but even the vocalic *ṛ* (or, to be strict, *r* which is there in *ṛ* as a part of it) is understood by the *r* (of *raḥ*). On the *agrahaṇa* view, however, this is not possible and so, it is argued, an additional rule (say, ऋकारस्य च) will have to be framed. It is now pointed out, on behalf of the *agrahaṇa* view, that even with

this view, no new rule is necessary. For, it is claimed, that *ṛ* is actually mentioned specifically in the rule. *kṛpo* (< *kṛpor* < *kṛpos*) is not just a Geni. sing. (= *kṛpas*) of *kṛp*. It is a saṁdhi result of *kṛpa* + *uḥ* where *kṛpa* means the root *kṛp* (mentioned without the ending *as* of the Gen. sing) and *uḥ* (< *ur*) a Gen. sing. of *ṛ*. The whole expression means ' in the place of *ṛ* (a part) of *kṛp* '.[1] Since *ṛ* is actually mentioned, the additional rule ऋकारस्य च is not required.

(*p*. 25, *l*. 13) अस्मिन् निर्देशे सति etc. A possible objection is here anticipated and answered. The *agrahaṇavādin* does not recognize any parts in complex vowels. To him they are indivisible wholes. How can now he speak of *r* as a part of *ṛ* (in *kṛp*), which latter he has demonstrated, by means of an acrobatic feat, as being present in what otherwise seems to be a simple form, viz. *kṛpo* ? (Cf. Nāg. : नन्वखण्डवर्णपक्ष ऋकारप्रश्लेषेऽपि कथं सिध्यति ... ?) The objection is certainly very strong and even the *agrahaṇavādin* has apparently to admit it. But there is one thing. If Pāṇ., by resorting to this *avibhaktika nirdeśa*, speakes of *r* as a part of *ṛ*, then it will be meaningless if we did not accept the division to account for *l*- substitution in *kḷpta* etc. Bhar. apparently hints — he does not say so expressly — that it is not necessary to accept the parts as real; they may be imagined. Kaiy. is more explicit : तत्र ऋकारनिर्देशसामर्थ्याद् विभागं परिकल्प्यादेशो विधीयते ।

(*p*. 25, *l*. 14) स्फोटमात्रं प्रतिनिर्दिश्यते. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : अथ वोभयतः स्फोटमात्रं निर्दिश्यते, रश्रुतेर्लश्रुतिर्भवतीति. This *Mbh.* contains another, alternative explanation furnished by the *agrahaṇavādin* to account for *l*-substitution (*ṛ*>*ḷ*) even on the *agrahaṇa view*. The explanation is based on the concept of Sphoṭa.

The problem here, as will be recalled, is this : On the *agrahaṇa* view, *ṛ* and *ḷ* being indivisible wholes, what is taught for independent *r* and *l* cannot be applicable to *r* and *l* which are parts of *ṛ* and *ḷ*. If P. 8. 2. 18 is not applicable, how can we get finally *kḷpta* from **kṛpta* ? The reply is given by resorting to the theory of Sphoṭa. What Pat. says is that when Pāṇ. mentions *ro* and *laḥ*, he is not referring to the purely consonantal or independent *r* and *l* only. In both these cases (*ubhayathā*), i. e. the original *r* and the substitute *l*, he is referring to a generic *r* and a generic *l* which can embrace all varieties of those speech sounds. If he utters some particular *r* or *l*, that is because *varṇas* are realised in some particular form. That's all. Pat. paraphrases Pāṇ's रो लः by रश्रुतेर्लश्रुतिर्भवति '*l* is heard instead of *r*' which means that consonantal *r* is replaced by consonantal *l* and the one in *ṛ* by the one in *ḷ*. Cf. Kaiy. :

1. For a more detailed explanation of the Sū., see Notes under *ṛḷk* (*pp*. 172–173)

ततश्चान्तर्भूतानन्तर्भूतरेफलकारव्यक्तिव्यङ्ग्यं सामान्यं स्थान्यादेशभावेनाश्रीयते. It seems more or less clear that Pat. has used the word *sphoṭamātram* in the sense of a speech sound in its generic aspect, a generic speech sound, which may have different phonetic shapes in different phonetic environments. Thus both the varieties of both *r* and *l* being included in Pāṇ's utterance, there is no difficulty for the *agrahaṇavādin*. No additional rule like ऋकारस्य च is necessary for him.

Sphoṭa is an important concept in the history of the philosophy of the traditional Sanskrit Grammar. Modern scholars have generally accepted that the concept of Sphoṭa has not been uniform; it has changed from age to age and from author to author.[1] Suffice it to say that while the classical concept of Sphoṭa (such as the one developed by Bhar. in his *Vākyap.*) makes it a meaning-bearing symbol which is permanent and which is above the phonemes, that of Patañjali is a purely phonetic one. It conveys, as we saw above, generic speech sound or, alternatively, something like an auditory perception.

In the present *Dīp.* : अध्वनिक: स्फोटः ... नन्तर्भूतयो रेफयोः प्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् Bhar. interprets the *Mbh.* expression *sphoṭa* in three different alternative ways (which perhaps indicates that he was not quite sure in which sense exactly it was used by Pat., the reason for this being that the word *sphoṭa* had undergone a change of meaning over centuries. With his own interpretation of the term *sphoṭa*, Bhar. must have found it rather difficult to explain Pat.'s use). Sphoṭa, Bhar. says, is above the speech sounds (*adhvanikaḥ*). He imposes his view on Pat. when he says that Pat. has used the word *sphoṭa* in the sense of soundless or superphonemic (अध्वनिक:) entity. Since Sphoṭa is over and above the speech sounds, the doctrine that composite phonemes are partless and indivisible is unviolated (while at the same time it accounts for forms like *kḷpta*).

(*p.* 25, *l.* 15) ननु च ध्वनिमन्तरेण स्फोटस्योपलब्धिरेव नास्ति. An objection. The Sphoṭa is helpless to appear by itself. It has to be manifested by sounds. Also, the form in which it appears depends upon the particular physical sound that is uttered. So when you say *ro* only one kind of Sphoṭa, the one corresponding to the normal (independent) *r* sound, will be manifested. Similarly with *laḥ*. How can it represent the other *r* which is a part of *ṛ* (and *l* which is a part of *ḷ*)? It is in reply to this objection that Bhar. interprets *sphoṭamātram* in three different ways.

1. e. g. K. Kunjunni Raja, *Indian Theories of Meaning*; S. D. Joshi, *Sphoṭanirṇaya*. I have demonstrated the vicissitudes of the Sphoṭa theory in detail in my unpublished monograph — *Sphoṭa : From Pāṇini to Nāgeśa*.

(1) (*p.* 25, *l.* 15) एवं तर्हि य एवासौ आद्यो ध्वनिः ... तस्मादारूपमात्रग्रहणमुभयोः. This reply is still given on the view that Sphoṭa is something over and above the sounds and is manifested by them. Here *pratipādakaḥ* is equivalent to *vyāñjakaḥ* and *āśrīyate* is to be expanded as *vyāñjakatvena āśrīyate.* It is maintained that only the initial sound (of *r* and *l*) is here intended (*āśrīyate*) as a manifestor, for that manifests (*pratipādaka*) the *r* and *l* phonemes in a general way, without indicating their any particular form. The subsequent sound, which particularises the phoneme — viz. whether it is independent or whether it is a part of a composite phoneme — is not intended. Of course there is some particularity (विद्यमानेऽपि तत्र विशेषे), it is not denied. Still it is not felt in the absence of the manifestor. Just as, when the light is sufficient, a cow is seen in its particular form, but otherwise something is seen vaguely (*ārūpamātreṇa*). Similarly, in the present case, owing to the lack of subsequent sounds at our means, only a general form, manifested by the initial sound, is available to us.

It is interesting to note that the word *ārūpa* in the sense of a vague or indistinct form is met with in the context of Sphoṭa itself in the *sphoṭasiddhi* of Maṇḍana Miśra in the stanza 19. Read :

आरूपालोचितेष्वस्ति ह्यन्यथात्वप्रकाशनम् ।
तत्संस्कारक्रमाच्चापि व्यक्तं तत्त्वं प्रकाशते ॥

The expression is found in the *Vṛtti* also which begins : दृष्टमिदमारूपालोचिताः पदार्थाः क्वचिदन्यथा प्रकाशन्ते ... etc.[1]

(2) (*p.* 25, *l.* 19) अथ वा, कार्यवत् ... तावत एवाश्रयणम्. This alternative reply is given on the *kāryaśabda* or *kāryasphoṭa* view. According to this view the Sphoṭa is not permanent. The sound which is produced by the speech organs (to be specific, the first sound or the *prākṛta dhvani* as it is called elsewhere) is itself called Sphoṭa by some. On this view the reverberation (trailing sound) is not caused by speech organs, but by the first sound or the Sphoṭa itself. The only difference between this view and the preceding one is that in *ro laḥ*, instead of the Sphoṭa-revealing sound here that much part of the activity of the speech organs is intended which is sufficient to produce a general *r* and *l*. It means that that stage of the produced sounds *r* and *l* is here intended where they have yet to be bifurcated into the independent and the dependent *r* and *l*.

Bhar. in his *Vākyap.* I. 102 refers to the *kāryasphoṭa* view thus :

1. Kielhorn's ed. of the *Mbh.* (I. 250. 5) reads अव्यक्तमारूपं under *Vār.* 1 on P. 1. 2. 69. The version followed by Kaiy. and Nāg. reads अव्यक्तरूपं.

यः संयोगविभागाभ्यां करणैरुपजन्यते ।

स स्फोटः, स्फोटजाः शब्दा ध्वनयोऽन्यैरुदाहृताः ॥

The *Vṛtti* on this reads : अनित्यपक्षे स्थानकरणप्राप्तिविभागहेतुकः प्रथमाभिनिर्वृत्तो यः शब्दः स स्फोट इत्युच्यते । ... नित्यपक्षे तु संयोगजविभागजध्वनिव्यङ्ग्यः स्फोटः ।

(3) (*p.* 25, *l.* 21) अथ वा, स्फोटमात्रमिति ... रेफयोः प्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् . According to this interpretation, the word *sphoṭa* is used just in the sense of what is otherwise expressed by *ākṛti*. So the word *sphoṭa* here just means a class which is formed by individuals (*dravya*) which belong to it. So, when Pat. says स्फोटमात्रं निर्दिश्यते । रश्रुतेर्लश्रुतिर्भवति what he means is आकृतिर्निर्दिश्यते । राकृतेर्लाकृतिर्भवति. Now when an *ākṛti* is to be conveyed, it has to be conveyed, of necessity (*nāntarīyaka*), through some individual. An abstract *ākṛti* cannot be otherwise conveyed. On the other hand, when the individual is mentioned it is likely to cause a misunderstanding that that individual alone participates in the operation taught (श्रुतस्य द्रव्यस्य कार्ययोगित्वम्). So it has to be specifically said that the individual here does not stand for itself alone, it stands for the whole class as such. When this *ākṛtyāśrayaṇa* is declared it helps to make it clear that in *ro laḥ*, the actually uttered sounds *r* and *l* stand, both for their respective classes. In other words, although the actual sounds uttered are independent *r* and *l*, they also represent those *r* and *l* which are parts of *ṛ* and *ḷ* respectively (अन्तर्भूतानन्तर्भूतयो रेफयोः प्रतिपत्त्यर्थम्). — Incidentally, although the *Dīp*. mentions only रेफयोः, a लकारयोः also is understood. Cf. Kaiy. for this third interpretation : जातिस्फोट इत्यर्थः । ततश्चान्तर्भूतानन्तर्भूतरेफलकारव्यङ्ग्यं सामान्यं स्थान्यादेशभावेनाश्रीयते. (Incidentally, it may be noted that Kaiy. has borrowed the first two explanations. Also, as far as I know, Kaiy. is the first to use the term *jātisphoṭa*).

Bhar. in the *Vākyap.* I. 93 speaks of this Sphoṭa = *ākṛti* view thus :

अनेकव्यक्त्यभिव्यङ्ग्या जातिः स्फोट इति स्मृता ।
कैश्चिद् व्यक्तय एवास्य ध्वनित्वेन[1] प्रकल्पिताः ॥

The *Vṛtti* on this stanza specifically mentions the *Mbh.* passage under discussion. Read : आकृतिनित्यत्वाच्छब्दनित्यत्वं केचिदाचक्षाणाः 'उभयतः स्फोटमात्रं निर्दिश्यते, रश्रुतेर्लश्रुतिर्भवति' इत्येवमादिषु स्फोटशब्दवाच्यां शब्दत्वादन्यां क्रमजन्मभिरयुगपत्कालैराश्रयैः क्रमेण प्रकल्पितोपलब्धिनिमित्तसंस्कारां शब्दाकृतिमाचक्षते । उत्पत्तिमत्यस्तु शब्दव्यक्तयः सत्यव्यपदेश्यरूपत्वे स्फोटं व्यपदेश्यरूपमवद्योतयन्त्यो ध्वनिव्यपदेशं लभन्ते ।

On technical grounds Nāg. criticises severely Kaiy.'s statement about अन्तर्भूतानन्तर्भूतरेफलकारव्यङ्ग्यं सामान्यम् (which, it is evident, the latter had taken

1. With व्यक्तय एवास्य ध्वनित्वेन प्रकल्पिताः, cf. the *Dīp*. (*p*. 25, *l*. 22) तत्राकृतिनिर्देशे नान्तरेण ध्वनिमाकृतिं प्रतिपद्यते इति नान्तरीयकं द्रव्यम् ...।

from Bhar.) thus : यत्तु स्वतन्त्रास्वतन्त्रसाधारणजातिपरतयैतद्भाष्यव्याख्यानम्, तन्न। तादृशजातौ मानाभावात्। नरसिंहदृष्टान्तानुपपत्तेश्च। सादृश्यात्तु प्रत्यभिज्ञेत्यादिस्वोक्तिविरोधापत्तेश्च। किं चैवं सति रजातेरित्येव भगवान् वदेत्। किं च तादृशजातिसत्त्वे वर्णैकदेशानामपि तज्जातिमत्त्वेन वर्णग्रहणे ग्रहणपक्षस्यैव सिद्ध्या ग्रहणपक्षमुक्त्वा 'अथ वा न गृह्यन्ते' इति पक्षे तत्समाधानपरभाष्यासंगतेः। It would seem that Bhar.'s mind is open, and he wanted to suggest and try as many alternatives as possible. That is why he suggested three alternatives, the last of which is criticised by Nāg. via Kaiy. Nāg. on the other hand wields a ruthless logic, is inclined to identify himself with a particular school of grammatical philosophy consistently, often, one is led to believe, trying to impose his philosophy on his predecessors. He develops his own theory thus : वस्तुतः स्फोट एव श्रोत्रग्राह्यः। वायुनिष्ठरत्वादिना च तस्याभिव्यक्तिः। एवं च साक्षाद् रत्ववतोऽभावेन 'कल्पते' इत्यत्राप्यप्रवृत्तावस्य वैयर्थ्यापत्तिः। एवं च रेफावभासिनः स्फोटस्य प्रसङ्गे लकारावभासः स्फोट इत्यर्थः। एवं च कृपावपि तत्प्रवृत्तिः संभवत्येव। तत्रापि रेफावभाससत्त्वात्। आकारादौ तु नैवं ह्रस्वाद्यवभास इति न तत्राकारावभासप्रयुक्तकार्यापत्तिः। तदुक्तं रश्रुतेरित्यादि।

The whole discussion occurring in the commentaries on the *Mbh.* passage is illuminating. Whereas, on the one hand, it illustrates how later commentators were sometimes hard put to it to interpret old texts which held different views from their own, on the other hand it also throws light on the development of concepts like Sphoṭa over centuries.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 25) यत्तद्रेफात् परं भक्तेः. The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* runs thus : विनाम ऋकारग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। 'रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे'; 'ऋकाराच्च' इति वक्तव्यम्। इहापि यथा स्यात्, मातॄणामिति। यस्य पुनर्गृह्यन्ते 'रषाभ्याम्...' इत्येव तस्य सिद्धम्। न सिध्यति। यत्तद्रेफात् परं भक्तेस्तेन व्यवहितत्वान्न प्राप्नोति।

P. 8. 4. 1 : रषाभ्यां ... teaches that *n*, when it follows *r* or *ṣ* within a Pada is replaced by *ṇ*. The *grahaṇavādin* argues that for cases like *mātṝṇām* the *agrahaṇavādin* will have to frame an additional rule : ऋकाराच्च, while he himself is spared it, since *r* in the rule stands for *r* which is a part of *ṛ* also. But the *agrahaṇavādin* denies him this satisfaction. He claims that P. 8. 4. 1 : रषाभ्यां... cannot apply here even on the *grahaṇa* view. For, *n* does not immediately follow *r* of *ṝ* here, the two being intervened by what is called *bhakti* (or *ajbhakti*). So the *grahaṇavādin* is in no better position.

भक्ति — The word is here used just in its literal sense, part or portion, and thus is synonymous with भाग. According to the *Mbh.*, the sound *ṛ* has two parts : a consonantal *r* + some indescribable (*yat tat*) vocalic element. The word *bhakti* in this literal sense should be applicable to both these parts. This use of the word *bhakti* is different from that in the Prātiśākhyas, e. g. *ṚkPr*. 6. 47 which reads as रेफात् स्वरोपहिताद् व्यञ्जनोदयादृकारवर्णा स्वरभक्तिरुत्तरा i. e. a vowel-part consisting of *ṛ* is inserted (in pronunciation) after *r* if that *r* is preceded by

a vowel and followed by a consonant. According to this, *karhi*, for instance, is pronounced as *karṛhi* in the *Ṛv.* It will be seen that in spite of a common term being used, whereas the Prātiśākhya is describing a phonetic phenomenon in the recitation of *r* in a certain phonetic context, the *Mbh.* is concerned with the constitution of the phoneme *ṛ* and apparently uses the word *bhakti* as referring to both the consonantal and vocalic parts of it.

The *Mbh.* sentence : यत्तद्रेफात् परं भक्तेः is construed in two different alternative ways in the *Dīp.* (1) भक्तेः is taken as an Ablative co-ordinate with रेफात् 'that which follows *r*, the *bhakti*'. (2) भक्तेः is taken as Genitive ('the [*aj*] *bhakti* which follows *r*' (?)). In the first interpretation the *bhakti* refers to *r*, while in the second it refers to any vowel, *a*, *i* etc. Kaiy. gives only the first interpretation (रेफाद् भक्तेरिति समानाधिकरणे पञ्चम्यौ).

There is some difficulty in the second interpretation. There is no substantive which could be connected with the Genitive भक्तेः. Also भक्तेः यत् तत् makes no sense. If Ablative, what can follow after अकारभक्ति or इकारभक्ति ? Perhaps that is why Kaiy. ignores it.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 27) अड्व्यवाय इत्येवं भविष्यति. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : मा भूदेवम्। अड्व्यवाय इत्येव सिद्धम्। The *grahaṇavādin* says that it does not matter if P. 8. 4. 1 does not apply, because of the intervention of *bhakti*. The next rule (8. 4. 2 : अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्व्यवायेऽपि) teaches the cerebralisation of *n* even when some phonemes intervene between *r* and *n*. A phoneme which can be called *aṭ* is one such permitted sound. So *n* can become *ṇ*.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 27) एवं मन्यते, यथा अकारो ... etc. The *Dīp.* explains the *Mbh.* argument. When he argues as above, the *grahaṇavādin* thinks (*manyate*) that either by *savarṇagrahaṇa* or by *ākṛtigrahaṇa* some *aṭ* sound will comprehend the *bhakti* (which will then get the designation *aṭ*) so that with P. 8. 4. 2 the cerebralisation can take place.

There is some difference between Bhar. and Kaiy. as regards the parallel. Whereas Bhar. cites *a* as the *grāhaka*, Kaiy. mentions *ṛ*. He says : ऋकारेण यथा दीर्घो गृह्यते, एवमृकारभागोऽपीत्यर्थः. Nāg. however interprets the *Prad.* in such a way, as to make *a* etc. the *grāhaka*. Read : ऋकारावयवस्य रेफस्येव तदज्भागस्यापि केनचिदकारादिना ग्रहणादट्त्वमिति मन्यते.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 1) अस्त्यत्रेदं दर्शनम् ... etc. The use of *asti* at the beginning of the sentence is significant. Such sentences, while accepting theoretically or in a general way some statement, object to it on account of some particular factors. In the present case, whereas *savarṇagrahaṇa* or *ākṛtigrahaṇa* is admitted in principle, its application is opposed here on the ground that the *bhakti* is

nowhere read in the *Akṣaras.* The passage thus is rather connected with the *Mbh.* passage which follows, viz. ये व्यपवृक्ता अपि etc., thus serving to introduce it, although the usual expression *ity āha* is missing before that *pratīka.*

(*p.* 26, *l.* 2) येषामन्यत्राट्त्वमस्ति. The *Dīp.* says that only those phonemes which are elsewhere recognised as *aṭ*, can be accepted here as such in the matter of *ṇ*-substitution. The implication is that *bhakti* is nowhere else recognised as *aṭ*.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 2) ये व्यपवृक्ता अपि वर्णा भवन्ति. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* न सिध्यति। वर्णैकदेशाः के वर्णग्रहणेन गृह्यन्ते? ये व्यपवृक्ता अपि वर्णा भवन्ति। यच्चापि रेफात् परं भक्तेः, न तत् क्वचिदपि व्यपवृक्तं दृश्यते।

I do not know how to explain the *Dīp.* sentence which follows : एतदुक्तमित्यनेन योजनीयम्, although it looks so innocent. In इदं तु वर्णतुरीयम् etc. the *Dīp.* lists three reasons why the *bhakti* cannot be recognised as *aṭ* : (1) It is seen nowhere else. (2) It has no homogeniousness with any *aṭ* phoneme since (a) it has neither a separate *prayatna* as apart from that of the whole (viz. *ṛ*), (b) nor has it any specific point of articulation. (3) Such a sound-fraction cannot manifest any class (like *a-tva* etc.) which would have enabled its bracketing with another recognised phoneme (like *a*). Cf. Kaiy. : तस्य भागस्य स्फुटप्रतिभासाविषयत्वाज्जात्यभिव्यक्तिहेतुत्वाभावाच्चेति भावः. On this, Nāg. observes : जात्यभिव्यक्तीति। अत्वादिजातीत्यर्थः। एवं न केनाप्यचा तद्ग्रहणमित्यर्थः।

(*p.* 26, *l.* 5) एतैरेवाक्षरसमाम्नायिकैरिति. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* runs thus : एवं तर्हि योगविभागः करिष्यते। 'रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे'। ततः 'व्यवाये'। व्यवाये च रषाभ्यां नो णो भवतीति। ततः 'अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्भिः' इति। इदमिदानीं किमर्थम्? नियमार्थम् — एतैरेवाक्षरसमाम्नायिकैर्व्यवाये, नान्यैरिति।

When it is pointed out to the *grahaṇavādin* that P. 8. 1. 2: अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्व्यवायेऽपि also does not help him to secure *ṇ*-substitution in forms like *mātṝṇām*, he finally resorts to a usual trick of interpretation, viz. the *yoga-vibhāga*. He suggests that the rule अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्व्यवायेऽपि be split into two : (1) अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्(भिः) and (2) व्यवायेऽपि. Of these two, the latter, व्यवायेऽपि, be read first and अट्कुप् ... etc. will follow it. The order of rules will then be as follows :

रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे।

व्यवायेऽपि (रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे)।

अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्भिः (व्यवायेऽपि रषाभ्यां ... etc.)।

The new rule व्यवायेऽपि, which allows intervention of any speech sound, secures *ṇ*-substitution even when the *bhakti* intervenes. When such an omnibus

provision is there, one will naturally ask, where is now the need of reading अट्-कुप्वाङ् ... ? Do not *aṭ*, velars (*ku*) etc. come under the previous rule ? Yes. They do. But the weakness of that rule is that it is too wide. It would undesiredly sanction *ṇ*-substitution even when there is intervention of palatals etc. The new rule helps us here. Since the *ṇ*-substitution is already achieved for *aṭ, ku* etc, this re-teaching in their case serves as a restriction : if *ṇ*-substitution is to be there even with the intervention of members of the Akṣaras., then it will be there only when there is the intervention of the Akṣaras. sounds *aṭ, ku* etc., not when there is an intervention of other members of the Akṣaras. This serves to exclude palatals etc., whose intervention thus successfully prevents *ṇ*-substitution. The beauty of this interpretation is that this restriction cannot restrain the *bhakti*, because it is not *ākṣarasamāmnāyika*. Clever, indeed !

प्रत्याय्या अपि आक्षर ... etc. A possible minor doubt is dispelled by the *Dīp.* The speech sounds like *ā, ī* etc. are not read in the Akṣaras. They are not therefore *ākṣarasamāmnāyika*. How will their intervention be allowed ? No problem, says the *Dīp*. Here by the term *ākṣarasamāmnāyika* are meant not only those phonemes which are actually read in the Akṣaras., but also those which are comprehended (*pratyāyyāḥ*) by them. The *bhakti*, on the other hand, is neither *pratyāyikā* not *pratyāyyā*. So it is outside the pale of the *niyama*. Similarly Kaiy. : आकारादयोऽप्यकारादिभिः प्रत्यायितत्वादाक्षरसमाम्नायिकाः । भक्तिस्तु न प्रत्याय्या न च प्रत्यायिकेति नियमेन न निवर्त्यते ।

Readings : (1) (*p*. 25, *l*. 1) Sw अग्रहणे. — (2) (*p*. 25, *l*. 2) Sw अकारादीनाम्. — (3) (*p*. 25, *l*. 3) MS नैष्वावयावौ ; AL तेष्ववयवौ (the text as in Sw). — (4) (*p*. 25, *l*. 6) AL यस्मिन् (for तस्मिन्). — (5) (*p*. 25, *l*. 7) MS AL Sw न स्यात् (for स्यात्). I would like to drop न as it goes against the tenor of the *Dīp.* here. — (6) (*p*. 25, *l*. 8) MS Sw नुडादि (Sw °दिषु) इडादिषु. — (7) (*p*. 25, *l*. 8) MS °यस्योचो ; Sw °यस्य चो° (for °यस्याचो° as in AL). — (8) MS प्रवर्तिष्यंति. — (9) (*p*. 25, *l*. 10) MSSw यत्र च. — (10) MSSw अव्ययवर्गज्ञा (Sw °स्त) यकात् ; AL अव्ययवर्गज्ञापकात्. — (10A) (*p*. 25, *l*. 11) MSSw योगविभागो न. — (10B) (*p*. 25, *l*. 11) The MS reads योगविभागाद्वा between ज्ञापकाद्वा and दीर्घाच्छे etc. But दीर्घाच्छे तुकं शास्ति is itself the *jñāpaka*. So I have shifted योगविभागाद्वा, thus bringing ज्ञापकाद्वा ' दीर्घाच्छे तुकं शास्ति ' together. — (11) (*p*. 25, *l*. 11) MS ननुरेवम् ; AL ननु चैवम् (for न त्वेवम् as in Sw). — (12) (*p*. 25, *l*. 14) Ed. °त्रं निर्दिश्यते. — (13) (*p*. 25, *l*. 16) AL Sw रूपमात्रस्य. The two eds. thus miss the important word आरूप°. — (14) (*p*. 25, *l*. 17) MS Sw °पादकः यं ; AL °पादकः यः. AL °दायस्थो यः. — (15) MS AL Sw तत्राविशेषे (MS °षि). I have emended [अ] विशेषे to विशेषे in view of the intended idea. — (16) (*p*. 25, *l*. 18) MS गविशेषे ; ALSw गोविशेषे. The MS reads [ऽ] श्चोपलब्धिर्, which is adopted by the eds. I read the whole expression as गोर्विशेषेणोपलब्धिर् to balance the following आरूपमात्रेण वोपलब्धिर्. My mind, how-

ever, is open and I am not quite sure that गोविशेषेऽश्चोपलब्धिर् was not intended by Bhar. Read particularly such passages as the following which appear in the context of the indistinct perception (*ārūpamātreṇa grahaṇam*) of the Sphoṭa : ... 'विषयेन्द्रियधर्म एवायं प्राकृतचक्षुषां दूरादाकृतिमात्रोपलब्धौ वृक्षादीन् हस्त्यादिवत् प्रतिपद्यन्ते' (the *Vṛtti* on the *Vākyap*. I. 89). 'यथा विदूरवर्तिवनस्पताविन्द्रियसंनिकर्ष एव विपर्यासस्य निमित्तम्' (*Sphoṭasiddhi*, under Kārikā 22). I keep the problem open. —(17) (*p*. 25, *l*. 22) AL °रेणाधानम्; Sw °रेणा(भि)धानम्.—(18) (*p*. 25, *ll*. 22–23) MS आकृति; AL आकृतिः. — (19) (*p*. 25, *l*. 23) Sw कार्ययोगित्वम्. — (20) (*p*. 25, *l*. 25) MS वास्समा°; AL वा सामा°; Sw चा(स्या)स्सामा° (for वास्याः सा°). —(21) (*p*. 25, *l*. 27) MS षात्; Sw ऽच्त्वात् (for ऽणुत्वात्). — (22) (*p*. 26, *l*. 1) MS Sw दर्शनं (for दर्शनेन as in AL). — (23) MS एवामा; AL Sw एवामी (for एव ये). — (24) (*p*. 26, *l*. 2) MS येषामन्यत्त्रास्वमस्येतियप्रपन्नादन्यो; AL येषामन्यत्र स्थानमस्ति इति ये प्रतिपन्नास्ते; Sw येषामन्यत्रा एवमस्येति य प्रयत्नादन्यो (?). Neither of the emendations done in the eds. is at all satisfactory. We have to start with deleting the last six letters viz. यप्रपन्नादन्यो as they are written in anticipation of यप्रयत्नादन्यो (occurring in line 4). I guess that the MS त्रास्वमस्येति is corrupt for the original °त्राद्त्वमस्तीति. It will be recalled that अद्त्व is the point of discussion here. — (25) (*p*. 26, *l*. 3) MS सवर्णम्. — (26) (*p*. 26, *l*. 4) MS नन चेयान्; AL न त्वेष; Sw ननु चेयान्. It seems the sound न in the MS is an inadvertent repetition, which Sw has unnecessarily emended into नु.

[5. 2]

(*p*. 26, *l*. 8) प्लुतावैच इदुतौ (*Vār*. 12). This is actually P. 8. 2. 106. It is quoted here, with *anuvṛtti* of *agrahaṇe* from the previous *Vār*. The *Mbh*. on this runs as : एतच्च वक्तव्यम् । यस्य पुनर्गृह्यन्ते, गुरोष्टेरित्येव तस्य सिद्धम् ।

(The *Dīpikā* :) सत्यपि व्यपवर्गे यदाऽग्रहणम् ... etc. The point made is that Pāṇ. had to frame this rule unnecessarily, since he seems to have held the *agrahaṇa* view; had he held the *grahaṇa* view he could dispense with this rule. The rule says that when there is an occasion (such as the one mentioned in P. 8. 2. 83 ff.) for *ai* and *au* to become Pluta, it is *i* and *u*, the second parts of these diphthongs, that become Pluta. Now if Pāṇ. had resorted to the *grahaṇa* view, the rule P. 8. 2. 86 : गुरोरनृतोऽनन्त्यस्याप्येकैकस्य प्राचाम् would have sufficed. That rule provides for a Pluta substitute for a heavy vowel (except *ṛ*), final or non-final. Combined with P. 8. 2. 82 : वाक्यस्य टेः प्लुत उदात्तः, that rule would have provided for the Pluta of the *ṭi* portion (i. e. *i* and *u*) of *ai* and *au* if the *grahaṇa* view were accepted. On the *agrahaṇa* view the parts *i* and *u*, although clearly visible separately (सत्यपि व्यपवर्गे), are not recognized as the same as the independent *i* and *u*; so they do not get the name *ac*, and consequently no name *ṭi* also (which requires an *ac* for this designation). So P. 8. 2. 82 :

वाक्यस्य टेः. etc. cannot apply. Hence the unnecessary formation of the additional rule P. 8. 2. 106 : प्लुतावैच इदितौ which could have been spared.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 11) आकारादीनां चात्राभावोऽव्यपवर्गात्. It is pointed out that heavy vowels like *ā* have no clearly separately visible final part (*ṭi*). So the present discussion does not apply to it. This point is not noted by Kaiy. but Nāg. notes it. Read : गुर्ववयवटिश्चैच एव संभवति, नान्यस्याकारादेस्तदवयवस्य व्यपवृक्तत्वाभावादिति भावः ।

Observation : The MS seems to read ओकारादीनां, but Sw reads it as आकारादीनां which I have adopted. It is to be pointed out that the position of *e* and *o* on the *grahaṇa* view is not clear in this respect. If there is *vyapavarga* between the parts *a* and *i/u* in *e/o*, then the rule गुरोरनृतो ··· etc. will apply to these parts also and they will become Pluta. This, however, is clearly against Pāṇini's view who allows this only for *ai* and *au*. Perhaps Bhar. gets out of the difficulty (if the reading ओकारादीनाम् is genuine) by saying that there is no *vyapavarga* in the case of *e/o*, but this goes agains Pat. who has earlier stated in a general way that there is *vyapavarga* in the diphthongs. (Cf. the *Mbh.* on the *Vār.* 9 : यत्र तर्हि व्यपवर्गोऽस्ति ? क्व च व्यपवर्गोऽस्ति ? संध्यक्षरेषु ।) Nāg. here remarks : गुर्ववयवटिश्चैच एव संभवति, नान्यस्याकारादेस्तदवयवस्य व्यपवृक्तत्वाभावादिति भावः. It is not clear whether the Saṁdhi चैच is to be resolved as च+ऐच or च+एच. The point seems to have been left undecided in the tradition. Independently it is evident that auditorily there is no *vyapavarga* in *e/o*.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 11) क्रियत एतन् न्यास एव. Reply given by the *agrahaṇavādin*. The full text of the *Mbh.* is as follows : यस्यापि न गृह्यन्ते, तस्याप्येष न दोषः । क्रियत एतन्न्यास एव ।

What is meant is that if the rule प्लुतावैच इदितौ is to be framed for the *agrahaṇavādin*, it is equally necessary for the *grahaṇavādin*. It is a must for both (अवश्यकर्तव्यतां द्योतयति as Kaiy. says). The reason is that although there is what is called *vyapavarga* in the parts of *ai* and *au*, these *i/u* have a more open pronunciation than the ordinary *i/u*, i. e. the independent *i/u*. (Cf. the *Vār.* 10 above : संध्यक्षरेषु विवृतत्वात्.) This difference in the manner of articulation leads to the absence of homogeneousness which, in turn, results into absence of comprehension and the absence, therefore, of *ac*-status. When there is no *ac*-status the designation *ṭi* is not available for *i/u* of *ai* and *au*. So no Pluta even for the *grahaṇavādin*. He cannot escape प्लुतावैच इदितौ. Similarly Kaiy. : व्यपवृक्तत्वेऽपि भागयोर्विवृततरत्वात् प्रयत्नभेदाद् इकारोकाराभ्यामग्रहणाद् अच्त्वाभावात् (तन्मूलटित्वाभावाच्चेत्यपि बोध्यम् adds Nāg.). The upshot is that what is necessary has to be done, even though it means addition of one more rule, for आवश्यकं गौरवं न दोषाय.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 13) सत्यपि समभागे ... अथाप्युत्तरभूयस्त्वम् ... etc. There are two views on the composition of *ai* and *au*. According to one view both *a* and *i/u* have one mora each. According to another, *a* has ½ mora while *i/u* have 1½ each. (This is the *uttarabhūyastva* view.) For both these views, see the *Mbh.* I. 22. 16–18 on the *Vār.* 4 : अतपर एच इग्घ्रस्वादेशे above, also *Vār.* 4 on P. 1. 1. 48. If we follow the latter view, *i* and *u*, since they have 1½ moras, cannot be called *ac* because, by definition, an *ac* is to have either one, two or three moras (P. 1. 2. 27 : ऊकालोऽज्झ्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः).

[5. 3]

तुल्यरूपे संयोगे द्विव्यञ्जनविधिः (*Vār.* 13). This is the last *Vār.* against the *agrahaṇa* view. The *Mbh.* on it runs as follows : तुल्यरूपे संयोगे द्विव्यञ्जनाश्रयो विधिर्न सिध्यति। कुक्कुटः, पिप्पलः, पित्तमिति। यस्य पुनर्गृह्यन्ते, तस्य द्वौ ककारौ, द्वौ पकारौ, द्वौ तकारौ।

The point made here is that on the *grahaṇa* view the two *k* sounds etc. will not be recognized as two different consonants. This means that certain operations which depend on the close contact of two consonants will be no longer possible. To illustrate : A succession or cluster of two (or more) consonants is technically called *saṁyoga* (P. 1. 1. 7 : हलोऽनन्तराः संयोगः). When a *saṁyoga* follows a preceding short vowel it is termed *guru* 'heavy' (P. 1. 4. 11 : *saṁyoge guru*). A *guru* vowel, under certain semantic conditions, can become Pluta (P. 8. 2. 86 : गुरोरनृतो ...). This Pluta is thus here the ultimate goal. It cannot be achieved if the basic condition, viz. the presence of two (or more) consecutive *hal* (consonant) sounds is not fulfilled. (So additional provision will have to be made — if the *agrahaṇa* view is to be adopted.) For himself, says the *grahaṇavādin*, there is no difficulty, of course. There are two *hal*-s in *-kk* etc., because the two can be separately comprehended by *k* read in the Akṣaras. Kaiy. tersely says : तस्य (संयोगस्य) एकवर्णत्वं पूर्वपक्षे, सिद्धान्ते तु वर्णद्वयरूपता। He adds : आशूच्चारणात्तु भ्रान्तमेकत्वज्ञानमिति शिष्टसमाचारः।

तुल्यरूपावयवत्वात् तुल्यरूपः संयोगः etc. Similarity requires two things, and *saṁyoga* being one the adjective *tulyarūpa* does not agree with it. So, by *saṁyoga* you have to understand secondarily *saṁyogāvaya*, which two have mutually similar forms. (Similarly Kaiy. : तुल्यरूपावयवत्वात् संयोगस्तुल्यरूपः.)

(*p.* 26, *l.* 18) अभिप्रायः — यथैवाकारादिषु ... etc. The position of *-kk-* is the same as that of *ā*, for instance. In both, the parts, since these are not felt to be separate, do not get the designation (*vyavahāra*), *k* and *a* respectively (and consequently do not participate in the operation taught for their independent counterparts). — Here one is tempted to say : But one *does feel* the two *k*

sounds separately! The reply is already given by Kaiy. (quoted above) — This is only *pūrvapakṣa*. 'सिद्धान्ते तु वर्णद्वयरूपता.' — After तुल्य: अव्यपवर्गः, add (something like) : तस्माच्च अवयवगतव्यवहाराभावः.

(*p*. 26, *l*. 20) अल्पत्वमहत्त्वकृतस्य विशेषस्यानुपादानात् etc. The opponent may ask : why is it necessary to look upon *-kk-* as a single consonant, just like an ordinary *k* ? The two differ in their extent, one is short while the other is long. So *kk-* must be looked upon as two *hal* sounds. — No, says the *grahaṇavādin*. On the *ākṛti* view such differences are not taken into consideration. The universal *k-* ness is common to both. So *-kk-* has to be looked upon as one *hal*.

(*p*. 26, *l*. 22) मात्राकालोऽत्र गम्यते । न च मात्रिकं व्यञ्जनमस्ति। This is a part of the reply given by the *agrahaṇvādin*. The full text runs thus : यस्यापि न गृह्यन्ते, तस्यापि द्वौ ककारौ, द्वौ पकारौ, द्वौ च तकारौ। कथम्? मात्राकालोऽत्र गम्यते। न च मात्रिकं व्यञ्जनमस्ति। अनुपदिष्टं सत् कथं शक्यं विज्ञातुम्? असच्च कथं शक्यं प्रतिपत्तुम्? Here the *Mbh*. points out that according to the auditory impression of the listner, a sound like *-kk-* takes full one mora for its utterance, while all other known consonants take only half a mora. There is no consonant requiring a full mora. Evidently we have to accept *-kk-* as consisting of two consonants.

In the *Dīp*. which follows (*p*. 26, *ll*. 23 ff.) (which ellucidates the *Mbh*. : अनुपदिष्टं सत् कथं शक्यं विज्ञातुम्) three criteria are mentioned for the acceptance of a speech sound : (1) The *pāṭha* or the *upadeśa* i. e. the reading in the Akṣaras. (2) In the absence of such inclusion in the Akṣaras., the *grahaṇa*, i. e. comprehension by an *aṇ* phoneme or (3) a specific mention in the Sū. It is further pointed out that the grammatical recognition of a speech sound (through *upadeśa* etc.) in its turn depends on its use by the *śiṣṭa*-s.

(*p*. 26, *l*. 24) सामान्यतो दृष्टानुमानात् — The *Dīp*. says that the existence of long vowels (*ā*, *ī* etc.) is known from inference (specifically called सामान्यतो दृष्टानुमान). Can it not be known by *grahaṇa* (1. 1. 69) ? No. This rule helps an *aṇ* to comprehend its homogeneous phoneme, provided the latter is already known to exist, not before that. But how does one know it ? By सामान्यतो दृष्ट°, says the *Dīp*. अस्ति ह्यगाकृतिर्दीर्घा, यथा संध्यक्षराणि is the form of the inference. Here *actva* ' being an *ac*, i. e. a vowel ' forms the *hetu* and the diphthongs form the *udāharaṇa*. So the syllogism may be strictly stated like this : अस्त्यगाकृतिः दीर्घा। अच्त्वात्। संध्यक्षरवत्. — Here अगाकृतिः could be a Bahuvrīhi — ' belonging to the *ak* class '.

Such an inference is called सामान्यतो दृष्टानुमानम् because we can actually see the length of vowels only generally; i. e. only in a few cases, viz. in the diphthongs, not in all — of course as far as the grammatical authority is con-

cerned. The *Nyāyakośa*[1] gives the example of the inference of the sun's movement from its being seen in two different places (at different times). Read : व्रज्यापूर्वकम् अन्यत्र दृष्टस्य अन्यत्र दर्शनम् इति। यथा चादित्यस्य। तस्मादस्त्यप्रत्यक्षापि आदित्यस्य व्रज्येति (p. 1014). It also quotes Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya (on NS 1. 1. 5): सामान्यतो दृष्टं नाम — यत्राप्रत्यक्षे लिङ्गलिङ्गिनोः संबन्धे केनचिदर्थेन लिङ्गस्य सामान्यादप्रत्यक्षो लिङ्गी गम्यते। यथेच्छाभिरात्मा। इच्छादयो गुणाः, गुणाश्च द्रव्यसंस्थानाः, तद्यदेषां स्थानं स आत्मा।

Observation : The MS seems to read अजकृतिः which the editions read as अजाकृतिः. But this does not seem satisfactory. Firstly, the length of all vowels is not in doubt. The diphthongs are read long. So, actually *ak* can be the *pakṣa*. Secondly अस्त्यजाकृतिः दीर्घा। अच्त्वात् is not a valid argument. It is begging the question.[2]

(*p.* 27, *l.* 1) एतस्य चेदं बीजम् etc. The *agrahaṇavādin* here gives another logical reason why for him too *-kk-* etc. constitute two consonants. These double consonants, *-kk-* etc., are different from long vowels like *ā* (admittedly a single vowel), in that there is a break in the activity of speech organs in the utterance of *-kk-* etc. but not so in the utterance of *ā* etc. *Ā* is uttered with a single effort; i. e. the speech organs continue their activity uninterruptedly when *a*, uttered at the first moment, is lengthened out to *ā*. (But Bhar. seems to have either ignored or forgotten that duration is not the only difference between *a* and *ā*. *A* is closed while *ā* is open.) The consonant cluster *kk* however is not pronounced with a single continuous effort. With the first effort one *k* is uttered, there is a temporary break in the activity of speech organs, which then again resume it and with this second effort the second *k* is uttered. The number of efforts decides the number of phonemes uttered. *Kk* is like *aa*. — In this section the word *vyañjana* is used in the *Dīp.* in the sense of a *dviruktavyjañjana* 'a repeated or geminated consonant'.

(*p.* 27. *l.* 6) इह तु कथं, सय्ँयन्ता ... etc. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : यद्यपि तावदत्रैतच्छक्यते वक्तुं यत्रैतन्नास्ति—अण् सवर्णान् गृह्णातीति, इह तु कथम् — सय्ँयन्ता, सव्ँवत्सरः, यल्ँलोकम्, तल्ँलोकमिति यत्रैतदस्ति अण् सवर्णान् गृह्णातीति? The *agrahaṇvādin* having rejected the examples *kukkuṭa* etc., the *grahaṇavādin* now adduces a different set of examples, सय्ँयन्ता, सव्ँवत्सरः etc. to show that the *agrahaṇavādin* cannot account for a *dvivyañjanāśraya-vidhi* in these cases. The difference in the two sets of examples is that in the previous set of examples the consonants involved viz. *k*, *p* etc. are not included in *aṇ*, whereas *y*, *v* which

1. By Bhīmācārya Zalakīkar, Pub. BORI, Poona, 1928.

2. I am thankful to Prof. V. N. Jha for this discussion.

are now mentioned are. In the earlier case it was possible for the *agrahaṇa-vādin* to say that there are no one-mora consonants (अभावं प्रतिपन्नः), because there was no *savarṇagrahaṇa*. But now the *savarṇagrahaṇa* is possible in the case of y̆̆y, v̆̆v by *y*, *v* of the Akṣaras. What has the *agrahaṇvādin* to say here (इह तु कथम्) in defence of his view ? — पूर्वत्र=पूर्वोक्तेषु उदाहरणेषु. अभावम् — क इत्यादीनाम् एकमात्रिकव्यञ्जनत्वेन इति शेषः. The subject of प्रतिपन्नः is भवान्, the अग्रहणवादी. — अन्तस्थाः (*y*, *v*, *r*, *l*). The word is fem. — ता ग्रहीष्यन्ते समुदायम् — *y* will comprehend y̆̆y, *v* will comprehend v̆̆v etc. — तत्राकारवत् = तत्र + आ°. —शास्त्रेण = ग्रहणकशास्त्रेण.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 8) अत्रापि मात्राकालो गम्यते etc. The *Mbh.* simply repeats the old argument as being relevant here also. The semi-vowels fare no better than stops. Besides, there is the additional difference pointed out by the *Dīp.*, viz. one member of the cluster is nasal, while the other is pure. So clearly two different consonants.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 9) अत्र सानुनासिको निरनुनासिकश्च भविष्यति. This suggestion is summarily refuted by the *agrahaṇavādin*. A single effort cannot produce first a nasal and then a non-nasal. You have to posit two separate efforts, which again means that two consonants are involved here. There is no *ekamātrika* consonant.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 11) असच्चेत् कथं गृह्येत etc. Earlier, the *grahaṇa* was mentioned as one of the proofs for the acceptance of a phoneme. Here it is made clear that an *aṇ* sound can comprehend another on the strength of the *savarṇagrahaṇa*, only if the sound to be thus grasped existed. Not otherwise. The sound *a* (though *aṇ*) cannot comprehend a half *a* (though it would be its homogeneous), for the simple reason that half *a* does not exist. The job of the *grahaṇaka* rule is the comprehension of an existing homogeneous sound, not the manufacturing or imagining one that does not exist. (Kaiy. does not express himself on this point, but Nāg. observes pointedly : अणुदिच्छास्त्रं हि विद्यमानस्य लोकसिद्धस्य सवर्णस्य ग्राहकमेव, न त्वप्रसिद्धसवर्णकल्पकमिति भावः.)

So in spite of the *savarṇagrāhaka* capacity of *y*, *v*, the existence of one-mora y̆̆y etc. is not proved. They have to be accepted as a *saṁyoga*.

Readiugs : (1) (*p.* 26, *l.* 9) MSSw तत इदं; AL तत्रेदं. — AL वक्तव्यमेव (for °व्यम् 'ऐच). — (2) (*p.* 26, *l.* 10) Sw ऽसा(व)च् (for °न्त्योऽच्). — (3) MSSw टित्संज्ञम्. — (4) (*p.* 26, *l.* 11) MS ओकारादाना चा × मावाव्ययसगति (corrupt); AL ऐकारादीनां चात्र प्राचां व्यपवर्गात्; Sw आकारादीनां चा ... मावाव्यप°. See *Notes*. — (5) (*p.* 26, *l.* 14) AL अध्यर्ध- (for [अ]प्यध्यर्ध-). — (6) (*p.* 26, *l.* 15) MSSw स्वस्यास्तस्यास्ति; AL स्वस्यास्तत्रास्ति. — (7) (*p.* 26, *l.* 17) MS AL °रूप्यवयव-त्वात्. — (*p.* 26, *l.* 18) MS तुल्यरूपह्यम्; Sw °रूपम्. — (8) (*p* 26, *l.* 25) MS

Sw आप्लुतोऽपि को. — (9) (*p.* 27, *l.* 1) Sw -करणः. — (10) (*p.* 27, *l.* 3) MS कर्ण (for करणं). It must be noted that the MS reading could be कर्ता equally. — (11) MSALSw एवं (for अयं). — (12) (*p.* 27, *l.* 4) MSSw यदि इहास्तलृचार°. — (13) (*p.* 27, *l.* 6) *Mbh.* Ed. यल्ँलोकं तल्ँलोकम्. — (14) (*p.* 27, *l.* 7) Sw (अ)तो (for ता). —(14 A) (*p.* 27, *l.* 8) Sw इमे (unnecessary emendation for इमाः). — (15) *Mbh.* Ed. गृह्यते (for गम्यते). — (16) (*p.* 27, *l.* 9) Sw °नासिकः (for the firs t°नासिकश्च). Sw drops [अ]त्र. — (17) (*p.* 27, *l.* 12) MS Sw मात्रमकारं; AL अर्धमात्रिकं (for [अर्ध] मात्रमकारं).

* * *

ha ya va raṭ / 5

The following six points are discussed under this Śiva-sū.:

I. *h* is read twice. Could it not be read only once (यदि पुनः पूर्व एवोपदिश्यते, पर एव वा)?

II. Should the order हयवरट् be retained or should it be profitably modified as हरयवट् (रेफो यकारवकाराभ्यां पूर्व एवोपदिश्येत — 'हरयवट्' इति, पर एव वा यथान्यासम्)?

III. Where should the phonemes called *ayogavāha* be read in the Akṣaras. (इमेऽयोगवाहा न क्वचिदुपदिश्यन्ते, श्रूयन्ते च। तेषां कार्यार्थं उपदेशः कर्तव्यः।... क्व पुनरेषामुपदेशः कर्तव्यः)?

IV. Are the phonemes, as phonemes, meaningful (किं पुनरिमे वर्णा अर्थवन्तः, आहोस्विदनर्थकाः)?

V. How are consonantal code-letters in the Akṣaras. kept out of *ac*-phonemes (vowels) (प्रत्याहारेऽनुबन्धानां कथमज्ग्रहणेषु न)?

VI. Why are semivowels read among *aṇ*- phonemes (किमर्थमन्तस्थानामणूपदेशः क्रियते)?

[I]

[1]

अयं हकारो ... etc. The full text of the *Mbh.* is as follows : सर्वे वर्णाः सकृदुपदिष्टाः, अयं हकारो द्विरुपदिश्यते — पूर्वश्चैव परश्च। यदि पुनः पूर्व एवोपदिश्येत, पर एव वा। The unique fact that *h* is read twice in the Akṣaras. naturally gives occasion for discussion. What is the special purpose in reading *h* twice? Could we not read it just once, like the others?

(*p.* 27, *l.* 16) पूर्वपरत्वं न वर्णान्तरापेक्षम् etc. The *Dīp.* remarks that obviously the *pūrvaparatva* refers to *h* itself in its two occurrences; for otherwise every other phoneme read here, except *a*, precedes some and follows some — it equally possesses *pūrvaparatva*.

[1. 1]

अइग्रहणेषु ह्ग्रहणम् . The full text of this *Vār.* is : हकारस्य परोपदेशेऽड्ग्रहणेषु ह्ग्रहणम् . Here the *Vār.* first takes up the परोपदेश view (i. e. deleting *h* from हयवरट् and reading it in the last Sū. हल् only). In the original set up, *h* is included in the *aṭ* phonemes. That serves some purposes. Now when *h* is deleted from हयवरट्, *h* is no longer in the *aṭ* group of phonemes. As a result, it is deprived of the operations which are taught in connection with the *aṭ* phonemes. So a new rule : हकारे च 'also when *h* follows' will have to be added after the rules which mention *aṭ* as a condition in connection with some operation. The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* runs as follows : हकारस्य परोपदेशेऽड्ग्रहणेषु ह्ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । 'आतोऽटि नित्यम्', 'शश्छोऽटि', 'दीर्घादटि समानपादे'; हकारे चेति वक्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात् — 'महाँ हि सः' ।

(*p.* 27, *l.* 18) किंचिदत्राड्ग्रहणं निष्प्रयोजनं ... etc. Before explaining the point at issue, the *Dīp.* makes here a minor observation. Among the three rules (containing *aṭ*) quoted in the *Mbh.*, there is P. 8. 4. 63 : शश्छोऽटि also. This rule teaches that in the context : a final *jhay* (non-nasal mute) + *ś* + *aṭ*, the *ś* is optionally replaced by *ch* when an *aṭ* phoneme follows. The *Dīp.* says that even if *h* is regarded as an *aṭ*, the combination *jhay* + *ś* + *h* is an impossibility in Sanskrit. So no purpose is served by citing that Sū. here. It is a mild rebuke at Pat. Kaiy., with more civility, simply says : शश्छोऽटीति । हकारपरस्य शकारस्यांभावात् प्रसङ्गोच्चारितमेतत् ·

(*p.* 27, *l.* 20) अत्र हि 'महाँ हि सः' etc. This *Dīp.* illustrates the point involved. महाँ हि सः is a combined illustration for P. 8. 3. 3 : आतोऽटि नित्यम् and P. 8. 3. 9 : दीर्घादटि समानपादे . This latter rule (P. 8. 3. 9) teaches that within a Vedic verse foot, a final *n*, preceded by a long vowel is replaced by *ru* when an *aṭ* phoneme follows (*mahān* > *mahār*). P. 8. 3. 3 further teaches that in this context *ā*, preceding this *r*(*u*), necessarily becomes nasal (so *mahā̃r*). (The final *r* eventually disappears, through an intermediate stage of *y*, thus ultimately yielding *mahā̃.*) On the परोपदेश view, the initial change *n* > *ru* will not be possible to explain, since *h* would no longer be an *aṭ* phoneme.

[1. 2]

Here there is a *Vār.* : उत्वे च, with the following *Mbh.* : उत्वे च हकारग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । 'अतो रोरप्लुतादप्लुते', 'हशि च', हकारे चेति वक्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात् — 'पुरुषो हसति', 'ब्राह्मणो हसति' इति । The *Vār.* says that on the परोपदेश view *h* is no longer included in the *haś* phonemes — rather *yaś* phonemes as one would have to say on this view (Cf. Nāg. : भाष्ये 'हशि च' इति सिद्धान्तरीत्या

निर्देशः । इदानीं तु 'यशि च' इति सूत्रम् ।). Since *u*-substitute taught by P. 6. 1. 114 : हशि च (पुरुषस् हसति > पुरुषर् ह° [P. 8. 2. 66] > पुरुषउ ह° [P. 6. 1. 114] > पुरुषो ह° [P. 6. 1. 87] will be no longer available, an additional rule हकारे च will have to be framed in order to account for cases like पुरुषो हसति.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 22) अश्ग्रहणमपि तु प्रयोजयति etc. Strangely enough, Bhar. takes no cognizance here of the *Vār.* उत्वे च. On the other hand he hastens to point out that there is one more desideratum. The phoneme *h* is included in the Pratyāhāra *aś*. As a result the form *bho hasati* is accounted for (*bhos* > *bhor* [P. 8. 2. 66] > *bhoy* [P. 8. 3. 17] > *bho* [P. 8. 3. 22]). But with परोपदेश view, *h* is no longer in *aś*. So there will be no *y*-substitution (and finally no *bho*). So a supplement हकारे च will have to be added after P. 8. 3. 17 : भोभगोअघोअपूर्वस्य योऽशि. This is evidently a case which both Kāt. and Pat. had overlooked and Bhar. is careful to point it out. Kaiy. follows him. Read : अश्त्वमपि न प्राप्नोतीति वक्तव्यं भो हसतीति रोर्यत्वार्थम्.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 24) अर्थप्रदर्शनमात्रमिदम् etc. After this, the MS reads : न वक्तव्यम् — उत्वे etc. This is puzzling. If by उत्वे हकारग्रहणम् the *Dīp.* is referring to the *Vār.* उत्वे च, why does it say that the *Vār.* should not be read ? Is the previous sentence अर्थप्रदर्शनमात्रपरमिदं meant to provide the reason for not reading the *Vār.* ? But how can that constitute a reason ? If the aim of the discussion is to list the purposes (*artha*) behind reading *h* in this or that place, how can one say the contrary thing viz. न वक्तव्यम् — उत्वे च हकारग्रहणमिति ? And has not Bhar. himself added the *aśgrahaṇa*, a point which had escaped Kāt. and Pat. ? Altogether the MS. reading न वक्तव्यम् makes no sense. So I venture to emend न वक्तव्यम् into [ते]न व°, thus taking the *Dīp.* as justifying the *Vār.* It may also be noted that I take *mātra-* (in अर्थप्रदर्शनमात्रमिदम्) in the sense of 'totality', not of 'only'. This would pointedly support the *Vār.* हशि च.

Observation : In the above discussion I have taken it for granted that by उत्वे हकारग्रहणम् Bhar. is referring to the *Vār.* उत्वे च ; in other words I understand that Bhar. does not quote the *Vār.* exactly, but is merely giving its substance. But there is another possibility. Could it be that the *Vār.* : उत्वे च was not there in the *Mbh.* version used by Bhar. ? If so, Bhar. may have added, as his own suggestion, उत्वे हकारग्रहणम्, just as he added *aśgrahaṇa* which was not there earlier. Our interpretation of *mātra-* as meaninig 'totality' and our emendation [ते]न tally well with this supposition. The only difference between the two cases would be that the *aśgrahaṇa* was not there in the *Vār.* at all, while *utve ca* was there in the *Vār.*, but was only missing in Bhar's version of the *Mbh.* But as far as Bhar. is concerned, this also was his new addition.

[1.3]

यदि च किंचिदन्यत्रापि ... etc. This *pratika* represents the concluding remarks of Pat. on this subject. The *Mbh.* runs thus : तस्मात् पूर्वश्चैवोपदेष्टव्यः परश्च । यदि च किंचिदन्यत्राप्युपदेशे प्रयोजनमस्ति, तत्राप्युपदेशः कर्तव्यः । It is surprising that Bhar. completely ignores the discussion on the other view, viz. पूर्वोपदेश alone, represented by the *Vār.* : पूर्वोपदेशे कित्वक्सेड्विधयो झलग्रहणानि च (which is explained, with illustrations, by Pat.) and hastens to the conclusion. Did he not find anything worth noticing here or is it, by any chance, that this portion of the *Mbh.* also was not available to Bhar. ?

Bhar.'s statement : न ह्यत्र वर्णानां रूपप्रतिपत्त्यर्थः पाठः, किं तर्हि ? शास्त्रप्रवृत्त्यर्थः, which brings out Pat's idea admirably well, is an important and explicit statement on the role of the alphabet given in Pāṇini's grammar. Those who want detailed information on phonemes of Sanskrit must look for it in other sources like the Prātiśākhyas and the Śikṣās. The Akṣars. is a means directed towards the economic and efficient functioning of the Grammar. (Similarly Kaiy.: प्रयोजनार्थो हि वर्णानामुपदेशो न स्वरूपप्रतिपत्त्यर्थः ।)

Readings: (1) (*p.* 27, *l.* 19) Both the earlier editions, following the MS, read a *daṇḍa* after उच्चार्यते. They begin a fresh sentence with शश्छोऽटि, connecting this *pratika* with what follows. But this clearly misses the point. शश्छोऽटि belongs to what precedes.

Secondly, AL read चामि (for चापि). If this is a wilful emendation (since they connect शश्छोऽटि इत्यड्ग्रहणं with the following चामि प्रयोजनवद् ... etc.), it must have been under the influence of the word प्रयोजन occurring in the *Vār.* छत्वममि तच्छ्लोकेन तच्छ्मश्रुणेति प्रयोजनम् which proposes to read अमि instead of अटि in P. 8. 4. 63 : शश्छोऽटि. But all this is irrelevant here. What Bhar. is saying here is that Pat's citing the rule शश्छोऽटि serves no purpose whatsoever; he probably did it through oversight. I think this has nothing to do with the relative merits of *aṭi* and *ami*. Even *शश्छोऽमि would be equally purposeless in this context. The emendation is unnecessary. — (2) (*p.* 27, *l.* 20) MSALSw अनणत्वात्. — (3) (*p.* 27, *l.* 24) MSALSw न वक्तव्यम्. For the emendation, see *Notes*.

[II]

[1]

The *Mbh.* represented by the *pratika* अयं रेफः is as follows : इदं विचार्यते — अयं रेफो यकारवकाराभ्यां पूर्वं एवोपदिश्येत, *हरयवडिति, पर एव वा यथान्यासमिति ।

With the *Dīp.* उभयत्र प्रयोजनं etc. cf. Kaiy. : उभयत्रापि दोषप्रयोजनसद्भावात् प्रश्नः । Nāg. makes a further comment : अन्यतरपक्षीयदोष एवान्यतरपक्षे प्रयोजनमिति भावः ।

[1. 1]

The *Dīp.* स्वर्नयति etc. is a comment on the following *Vār.* and the *Mbh.*: 'रेफस्य परोपदेशेऽनुनासिकद्विर्वचनपरसवर्णप्रतिषेधः' (वा. ४)। रेफस्य परोपदेशेऽनुनासिकद्विर्वचनपरसवर्णानां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। अनुनासिकस्य — स्वर्नयति, प्रातर्नयति। 'यरोऽनुनासिकेऽनुनासिको वा' इत्यनुनासिकः प्राप्नोति। द्विर्वचनस्य — मद्रह्रदः, भद्रह्रदः। 'यरः' इति द्विर्वचनं प्राप्नोति। परसवर्णस्य — कुण्डं रथेन, वनं रथेन। 'अनुस्वारस्य ययि ...' इति परसवर्णः प्राप्नोति।

The phoneme *r* is included in the *yar* (i. e. a consonant except *h*) group of phonemes, as a result of which two operations, taught for the *yar* phonemes, and one in connection with the *yay* phonemes, become due undesiredly for *r* also. So a provision for their prohibition with reference to *r* will have to be made, says the *Vār*.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 3) ... अनुनासिको णकारः प्राप्नोति etc. P. 8. 4. 45 : यरोऽनुनासिकेऽनुनासिको वा lays down optionally a nasal consonantal substitute for a final *yar* phoneme when a nasal consonant follows (e. g. एतद् मुरारिः or एतन्मुरारिः). The substitution will have to be made in the case of स्वर्+नयति also. The *Dīp.* mentions specifically that *ṇ* will have to come in as a substitute (because, evidently, of the final nasal consonant substitutes which are available, *ṇ* is preferred on the basis of *āntaratamya*, as it is cerebral like *r* which is to be replaced). The *Dīp.* न ह्यस्मिन् योगे सवर्णग्रहणमस्ति is a reply to a possible objection : How can *ṇ*, which is not homogeneous with *r* (since the *prayatna*-s of the two are different) be a substitute for it ? The reply is that the present rule which teaches the substitution does not require the substitute to be a *savarṇa*.

मद्रह्रद etc. P. 8. 4. 46 : अचो रहाभ्यां द्वे teaches optional reduplication of a *yar* phoneme in the context : a vowel + *r*/*h* + *yar*. Since *r* is included in *yar*, the *r* in *madrahrada* will have to be reduplicated.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 4) अत्र द्विर्वचने ... etc. Here an objection is anticipated and replied. It is suggested that let there be reduplication of *r*. No problem. For, out of the two consecutive *r*-s the preceding *r* will be dropped by P. 8. 3. 14 : रो रि. One still thus gets the desired form. — No, says the *Dīp.* The reduplication is taught by P. 8. 4. 46 while the dropping of *r* by P. 8. 3. 14. Both being in *tripādī*, the reduplication taught by P. 8. 4. 46, which is a later rule, is *asiddha* with reference to the earlier one, i. e. P. 8. 3. 14. Hence the prohibition sought by the *Vār*.

(*p*. 28. *l*. 5) कुण्डं रथेन etc. P. 8. 4. 58 : अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्णः requires an Anusvāra to be replaced by a *parasavarṇa* when a *yay* phoneme follows. So

the Anusvāra in कुण्डं also will have to be replaced by a *parasavarṇa*. Since it is not enjoined, that the *parasavarṇa* substitute should be nasal, a simple *r* will come in (*kuṇḍaṁ*>**kuṇḍar*). The *asiddha* nature of this *r* substitute and consequently the inability to delete it by P. 8. 3. 14 are common here also.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 8) पूर्वोपदेशे किरवप्रतिषेधः. This along with the following व्यलोप-वचनं च forms a single *Vār*. in the *Mbh*. The Bhāṣya on it is as follows : यदि पूर्वोपदेशः कित्त्वं प्रतिषेध्यम् । देवित्वा, दिदेविषति । 'रलो व्युपधाद् ...' इति कित्त्वं प्राप्नोति ।

Having pointed out the defect in the परोपदेश view (i. e. the present sequence), Kāt. now points out the defects (and the provision to be made to ward them off) on the suggested पूर्वोपदेश (i. e. *हरयवट्). The prospects of *v* are affected by this suggested change. Now *v* becomes a part of the *ral* group of phonemes — पूर्वोदेशे सति वकारोऽपि रल् — (which it is not in the traditional sequence). P. 1. 2. 26 : रलो व्युपधाद्धलादेः संश्च says that *ktvā* and *san*, if preceded by *iṭ* (i. e. *-i-tvā* and *i-ṣa*) become optionally *kit* (i. e. are regarded as furnished with the code-letter *k*) if they come after a verbal root which begins with a consonant, has *i*/*u* as the radical vowel, and ends in a *ral* consonant. This will result, for instance, in the optional forms **divitvā* and **didiviṣati* (along with *devitvā* and *dideviṣati*) which is not desired. Hence the necessity of the prohibition of *kittva*.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 9) व्यलोपवचनं च. Forms like गौधेर from गोधा (> गोध्, P. 6. 4. 148 : यस्येति च, > गौध्, P. 7. 2. 117 : तद्धितेष्वचामादेः) + ढ्रक् (P. 4. 1. 129 ; > एय्र, P. 7. 1. 2 : आयनेयी ... ; P. 1. 3. 9, > एर, P. 6. 1. 66 : लोपो व्योर्वलि) are derived by deleting *y* and *jīradānu* by deleting *v* (*jīv* + *radānu*) by means of P. 6 1. 66 : लोपो व्योर्वलि. In the suggested sequence (*हरयवट्) *r* is no more a part of *val* (वल्यनन्तर्भावात् रेफस्य). So a fresh provision will have to be made.

व्यलोपवचनं वकारार्थं etc. Here the *Dīp*. makes one clarification. The *Vār*. (6) : अनारम्भो वा under P. 6. 1. 66 : लोपो व्योर्वलि apparently refutes that Sū. How does Kāt. then here recommend व्यलोपवचनम् ? The *Dīp*. replies that as the *Mbh*. explains there, P. 6. 1. 66 is rejected only for वलोप (अनारम्भो वा पुनर्वलोपस्य न्याय्यः *Mbh*). For यलोप it is necessary.

[2. 1]

रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति. Having considered both the views Pat. ultimately decides in favour of the *paropadeśa* (अथ वा पुनरस्तु परोपदेशः). When attention is drawn to the defects of this view mentioned already, the *Mbh*. replies : अनुनासिक-परसवर्णयोस्तावत् प्रतिषेधो न वक्तव्यः । रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति । It means that as far as the nasal substitute ( )*vaṇ* for *svar*) and the *parasavarṇa* substitute (*kuṇḍar* for *kuṇḍaṁ*) are concerned, it is not necessary, for the simple reason that there

is no possibility of their presenting themselves as substitutes as they lack necessary homogeneousness. There is no phoneme homogeneous with *r* (as with the fricatives, too). So a framing of their prohibition is superfluous.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 11) ननु चोक्तम्, एकत्र सावर्ण्यस्याचोदितत्वात् etc. An expression of righteous indignation. When it was pointed out above that on the परोपदेश view *स्वण् will result undesiredly before नयति, and *कुण्डर् before रथेन, it was made clear that in the first case the rule does not say that the substitute has to be a *savarṇa*; similarly in the second case the rule concerned does not specifically say that the substitute has to be a nasal one. What does the opponent now mean by saying that there is no danger of either of these substitutes forcing itself, on the plea that *r* has no homogeneous phonemes? — Here एकत्र = 'यरोऽनुनासिके ...' इति अनुनासिकादेशे कर्तव्ये. अन्यत्र = 'अनुस्वारस्य ययि...' इति परसवर्णे कर्तव्ये.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 12) सत्यम्। एवमेतत् etc. The force of the above argument is admitted. The final reply, however, is not given. It is promised that the solution which will be offered in the case of reduplication (in मद्रह्रद्) will be applicable to these two cases also. — अयं वक्ता means the Siddhāntin in the *Dīp*.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 13) नेमौ रहौ कार्यिणौ etc. and तद्यथा। ब्राह्मणा etc. stand for the following one continuous passage of the *Mbh*.: द्विर्वचनेऽपि। नेमौ रहौ कार्यिणौ द्विर्वचनस्य। किं तर्हि? निमित्तमिमौ द्विर्वचनस्य। तद्यथा — ब्राह्मणा भोज्यन्तां माठरकौण्डिन्यौ परिवेविषातामिति। नेदानीं तौ भुञ्जाते।

The passage is explained at length by Bhar. The *Mbh*. stresses the point that *r* and *h*, although they are included in the *yar* group (see below !), do not undergo the reduplication taught for the *yar* group as a whole, because (the preceding) *r* and *h* are mentioned as a condition for reduplication. The special status of being *nimitta* 'cause' or 'condition' of this operation supersedes their general status of being *kāryin* 'undergoer of the operation'. To illustrate: When Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya are asked to serve food to Brāhmaṇas, the two, owing to the special job assigned to them do not get food themselves, in spite of their being Brāhmaṇas. In their case, the serving of food, directly ordered, supersedes their partaking of meal, which is only inferred because of their Brāhmaṇahood. Similarly here also.

Observation: Bhar's statement: यर इति निर्देशे रेफहकारयोरनुमीयत्वात् seems to be a case of Homer nodding. The statement can only apply to *r*; it cannot apply to *h* for the simple reason that *h* is not included in the *yar*! Perhaps the original *Mbh*. statement नेमौ रहौ कार्यिणौ द्विर्वचनस्य may be responsible for this. Since *h* is not a part of the *yar*, Pat. had no reason to bring in *h* in order to reject its undergoing the operation. (or is Pat. too nodding?) Kaiy. tries to explain away the *Mbh*. thus: हकारवद्रेफोऽपि न कार्यीत्यर्थः. Nāg. is more explicit: नन्वयत्वाद-प्रसक्तद्वित्वस्य हस्य ग्रहणमयुक्तमत आह — हकारवदिति.

यर इति निर्देशे. The MS actually reads very clearly व्यवहार (for यर). But this must be certainly an uncalled for invention of some 'learned' scribe. Bhar. is here contrasting the direct mention (साक्षात् चोदितत्वात्) of *r* and *h* by the word *rahābhyām* with their indirect mention (अनुमीयत्वात्) in this rule. The indirect mention can only refer to the Pratyāhāra *yar* (the word *yaraḥ* is continued in P. 8. 4. 46: अचो रहाभ्यां द्वे from 45 : यरोऽनुनासिके etc.). Purely orthographically, even प्रत्याहार could be the original text here. But the weightier considerations of logic still make me inclined to यर as the original reading.

A comparison with a similar situation dealt with in the *Dīp.* in the Āhnika III with hair-splitting arguments will be found interesting. Read : इह 'दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयताम्, तक्रं कौण्डिन्याय' इति ··· ब्राह्मणश्रुतौ कौण्डिन्योऽपि यद्यप्यन्तर्भूतः, तथापि कौण्डिन्यरूपेण नोच्यते। किं तर्हि? सामान्यरूपेण। ... यत्तु कौण्डिन्यायेति तक्रदानं तत् तु विशेषतया श्रूयते। ... तस्मात् यत्र च तेन रूपेण चोदितः संदिग्धो, यत्र च विशेषरूपेण चोदितोऽसंदिग्धः, ते क्रिये तत्र समुच्चयं न प्रतिपद्येते । कथं ह्यनुमानं प्रत्यक्षतक्रदानेन समकक्षीकर्तुं शक्यम्? तस्मात् प्रत्यक्षानुमानयोर्न समुच्चयो नापि विकल्पः। (*Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari*, Fasc. I : Āhnika III, Ed. G. B. Palsule, BORI, Poona, 1985, p. 5.) Poor follow, Kauṇḍinya ! He has to suffer everywhere !

(*p.* 28, *l.* 21) यद्येवं दध्युदके दोषः etc. This *Dīp.* points out that the above argument, viz. that what is taught directly or expressly sets aside what is taught only indirectly or known through inference, if both become due for someone or something simultaneously, — this argument can lead to difficulties. Take the case of the Saṁdhi *dadhyudaka* (from *dadhi* + *udaka*). This Saṁdhi is taught by P. 6. 1. 77: इको यणचि, where the vowels in general (*aci*), when they follow, are mentioned as the condition for the operation *ik* > *yaṇ*, whereas *ik* vowels (i. e. *ĭ*, *ŭ*, *ṛ̆*, *ḷ*) are specifically mentioned as undergoing the operation. Now, following the above logic of the opponent, *ik* vowels can only function as the undergoers of the operation, not as its cause. Therefore, *u* in *udaka* cannot bring out the *y*-substitution of *i* in *dadhi*.

Further — continues the opponent — you may perhaps argue thus : The two cases do not stand on a par. In the counter-example (*dadhyudaka*), two items are separately mentioned, one (*aci*) as the cause or condition, another (*ik*) as the undergoer of the operation. And so there will be no difficulty as it was alleged. But, in the form under contention, viz. *madrahrada*, *r* is the only item concerned. How can it be an undergoer of the operation, when it is the cause ?

But this is a fallacious reasoning. Even in *madrahrada* there are two different entities : *h* as the cause and *r* as the undergoer of the operation. What

prevents then the reduplication of *r* there ? Altogether, the disputant hints, the opponent's reasoning is wrong. He is blowing hot and cold in the same breath.

(*p.* 28, *l.* 26) दर्शनभेदाददोष: etc. The Siddhāntin replies that there is nothing wrong in his logic. Nor will any wrong form result on account of his procedure. The truth is, he suggests, that you cannot follow a uniform procedure in such matters. Sometimes one procedure works, sometimes another. One set of procedural principles is adopted to arrive at the form *madrahrada* (without the reduplication of *r*) and another (given further on, *p.* 29, *ll.* 15–16) to arrive at *dadhyudaka*. It is because of this adoption of two different, indeed opposite, sets of procedural principles that the directly mentioned status of a linguistic element supersedes the indirectly mentioned one in the case of *madrahrada* but not in the case of *dadhyudaka*.

The set of principles adopted for *madrahrada* is given as follows :

(1) आकृतिः पदार्थः ' A class constitutes an entity '.

(2) सकृल्लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम् ' A rule proceeds only once '.

(3) समुदाये लक्षणं प्रवर्तते ' A rule applies to the group (as a whole) '.

(4) ज्ञानाङ्गं शास्त्रम् ' Grammar is subservient to knowledge '. The *Mbh.* statement made in connection with *madrahrada*, viz. 'नेमौ रहौ कार्यिणौ... ' is made on the basis of this set of principles. Let us see how it applies.

P. 8. 4. 46 : अचो रहाभ्यां द्वे teaches reduplication of *yar* consonants in a certain environment. On the *ākṛti-padārtha* view the operation is taught for the *yar* class. In practice, *r* and *h*, though belonging to this class, are to be excluded for reasons stated above. This does not in any way go against the *ākṛti* mention of *yar*, as *ākṛti* is complete in every individual which belongs to it and so the *ākṛti* reference is satisfied even if some members undergo the operation while the others do not. Perhaps it will be said that although *r* has found scope as the *nimitta*, it has not found scope as tht *kāryin* ; so, it will be suggested, in order to give scope to this character of its, the rule अचो रहाभ्यां be applied once more. ' No ' is the reply, because of the second principle सकृल्लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम् . Perhaps it will be asked : But then what is the use of reading the *kāryin*-s as *yar*, if a part of it, viz. *r*, is never to be so reflected in the language ? The reply to such a question is given by the principle : ज्ञानाङ्गं शास्त्रम्. Grammar is meant merely to impart knowledge. It has nothing to do with linguistic usage (शास्त्रमनपेक्षितप्रयोगम्).

(*p.* 29, *l.* 1) कथमिह, ' यरोऽनुनासिके ... ' etc. How is this set of principles useful in applying यरोऽनुनासिके etc. to स्वर् नयति ? How is the undesired

substitute *स्वण् prohibited? An initial part of the reply is corrupt in the MS, viz. शास्त्रमनपेक्षितप्रयोगे रेफोसंध्यमाणा नास्ति शास्त्रत्वे. It is possible to read °प्रयोगे as °प्रयोगं, the sentence शास्त्रमनपेक्षितप्रयोगं meaning the same thing as ज्ञानाङ्गं शास्त्रम्, the same idea being expressed in a different way. But it seems to me better to retain प्रयोगे and to supply before it a word प्रयोगं as being lost haplologically. It gives the same effect, besides leaving प्रयोगे free for being connected with what follows. Similarly शास्त्रत्वे could, by a stretch of imagination, be understood as शास्त्रं च, thus the whole sentence शास्त्रं च पुनर्न प्रवर्तते being synonymous with सकृल्लक्षणं प्रवर्तते. So far so good. Still the remaining portion रेफोसंध्यमाना defies all attempts at reaconstruction. I provisionally accept AL's emendation रेफोष्मणां. An expression like अनुनासिकादेशः can be understood after it. Thus the whole reconstructed text (of course provisonally) will be शास्त्रमनपेक्षित- [प्रयोगम्] । प्रयोगे रेफोष्मणां [अनुनासिकादेशो] नास्ति । शास्त्रं च पुनर् etc. On the *ākṛti* view, the rule will apply to cases like *sanmārga* etc. where the condition of *āntaratamya* is fulfilled. It will not apply to cases where there is no *āntaratamya* (including our *svar*), but that of course does not matter. There is no reapplication of the rule on the strength of which **svaṇ* could intrude. No matter if some items taught in grammar remain unfulfilled, for what does not exist cannot be brought in usage on the strength of a rule. Bhar. cites a passage from the *Mbh.* on the Śiva-Sūs. ञमङणनम् । झभञ् । There a suggestion is made that instead of these two Sūtras, let us have only one viz. ञमङणनझभञ्. To the question as to what is to be done of the terms ङम् and ङमुट् used in P. 8. 3. 32, the reply is given that they should be replaced now by ङञ् and ङञुट्. To the further difficulty pointed out, viz. that in that case a following vowel will undesiredly have to be prefixed with *jh/bha*, when a preceding pada ends in short vowel + *jh/bh*, the reply given is न झकारभकारौ पदान्तौ स्तः (I. 36. 1, 2). *Jh* and *bh* do not occur as word final (cf. P. 8. 2. 39 : झलां जशोऽन्ते). So there is no possibility of the undesired augments *jhuṭ* and *bhuṭ*. The *Dīp.* suggests that a similar thing will take place here also. The substitute *svaṇ*, even if it became theoretically due, cannot materialise, simply because it just does not exist in the language.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 5) एवम् 'अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्णः' etc. By अनुस्वारसमुदाय is meant the group of *anusvāras*, or, to put it differently, the *anusvāra* in different environments. The परसवर्णसमुदाय means the five nasal consonants (*ṅ*, *ñ* ... etc.) along with the accompanying stop. The word *samudāya* is thus used here in the sense of a sound complex with reference to both the *anusvāra* and the *parasavarṇa*. An example will make this clear. The root *aṅk* 'to mark' is read in the Dhātupāṭha (P. Dh. I. 87) as *aki*. This *aki* first becomes *ank* (P. 7. 1. 58 : इदितो नुम् धातोः), then *aṁk* (P. 8. 3. 24 : नश्चापदान्तस्य झलि), and finally *aṅk* (P. 8. 4. 58 : अनुस्वारस्य ... etc.). Similarly *kaṭhi* (P. Dh., I,

283) >*kanṭh*>*kaṁṭh*>*kaṇth*. What is the procedure in the selection of the *parasavarṇa* in a particular case ?

The Sū. of course merely says that an *anusvāra* is replaced by a *parasavarṇa*. The *Dīp.* adds the clarification that the Sū. is applied only after the determination of the *anusvāra* complex and the *parasavarṇa* complex. To continue our example of *aṁk*>*aṅk* : The *para*, i. e. *k*, has four homogeneous phonemes, *kh*, *g*, *gh* and *ṅ*. Which one of these is to take the place of *ṁ* ? On the other hand, in accordance with the metarule P. 1. 1. 50 : स्थानेऽन्तरतम्:, the substitute has to be nearmost to the original (*sthānin*). Here the *sthānin*, i. e. the *anusvāra*, is a nasal sound. So the substitute also has to be a nasal consonant. Which one of the five nasal consonants is to be take the place ? It will be readily seen that *ṅ* which fulfils both the conditions (laid down by the metarule as well as by the specific injunctive rule) is selected.

Here the *Dīp.* says that when we examine the nearmostness (*āntaratamya*), we take into consideration the whole *anusvāra* complex and the whole *parasavarṇa* complex (तत्र स्थानेऽन्तरतमः इति समुदायेनानुनासिकनिमित्तमान्तरतम्यम्). By this process we arrive at the following five pairs :

anusvāra	*parasavarṇa*
-*ṁk*- (etc.)	-*ṅk*- (etc.)
-*ṁc*- (etc.)	-*ñc*- (etc.)
-*ṁṭ*- (etc.)	-*ṇṭ*- (etc.)
-*ṁt*- (etc.)	-*nt*- (etc.)
-*ṁp*- (etc.)	-*mp*- (etc.)
-*ṁy*- (etc.)	-*y̐y*- (etc.)

An example of -*ṁy*- > *y̐y* (optionally) is *say̐yama* 'control' (along with *saṁyama*) from *sam* + *yama*. Here *saṁ*° first becomes *saṁ*° (P. 8. 3. 23 : मोऽनुस्वारः), then optionally *say̐yama* (P. 8. 4. 58 : अनुस्वारस्य ययि etc., and 59 : वा पदान्तस्य).

The point in all this is that in the form under discussion (कुण्डं रथेन), the *anusvāra* complex, viz. -*ṁr*- has no corresponding *parasavarṇa* complex. The *parasavarṇa* complex -*rr*-, which the opponent thought would intrude, simply cannot materialise in the absence of *āntaratamya* with -*ṁr*- based on nasality. — Incidentally, (in line 7) the MS समुदायेनानुनासिकनिमित्तमान्तरतम्यम् is to be split as समुदायेन अनु° (and not as समुदाये नानु° as in AL).

(*p.* 29, *l.* 7) भवति हि समुदायः etc. Perhaps it may be asked how one can speak of the two complexes as being nearmost to each other when the

common factor, viz. nasality, resides only in a part of each. The reply is that it is a common practice to speak about a whole as possessing a certain property (*tadvān*) when actually it belongs to a part only. A city may have cows only in a part, yet one says गोमदिदं नगरम्. (This example occurs in the *Mbh.* at I. 217, 17.) In a group only some people may be possessed of a stick, yet people make a general statement : दण्डिनो गच्छन्ति. (The MS actually reads कुंडिनो, but I have followed the eds. and read दण्डिनो as it seems to me to be more probable. Incidentally, cf. छत्रिणो यान्ति, which is one of the later stock examples for a kind of Lakṣaṇā.)

(*p.* 29, *l.* 9) एवं परसवर्णेन ... etc. This contains the upshot of the discussion. Theoretically, the substitute has to be nearmost. In practice, as far as *r* is concerned, it is not so i. e. nearmost (तथाभूत: = अन्तरतम:) and so it is not qualified (अपराध्यति) to be the substitute. The *Dīp.* adds that since we are proceeding on the principle : सकृल्लक्षणं प्रवर्तते, there is no possibility of uttering the rule a second time, on the strength of which (i. e. since otherwise such an utterance will be meaningless) one could bring in a nasal *r* (सकृल्लक्षणव्यापार इति नास्ति रेफोऽनुनासिक:). It must be said that this argument is quite weak. Even a second utterance, if allowed, has no power to generate a linguistic element which does not actually exist. Just a few lines back the *Dīp.* has quoted the *Mbh.* ञकारभकारौ पदान्तौ न स्त: etc. which would go against this. Cf. also the *Mbh.* (I. 16. 8–9) : नैव लोके न च वेदे दीर्घप्लुतौ स्त:। कौ तर्हि? विवृतौ। यौ स्तस्तौ भविष्यत: which occurs twice (with a slight difference) under the Vār : दीर्घप्लुतवचने च संवृतनिवृत्त्यर्थ: on अइउण्. (It will be inferesting to quote the *Dīp.* on this, since it specifically mentions the case of nasal *r*. Read : इह किंचित् शक्यम् ... अन्तस्थास्तु शक्यन्त उच्चारयितुं सानुनासिकास्तत्रापि रेफोऽशक्य इति (*p.* 5, *ll.* 22–25). Of course, if one says that the statement सकृल्लक्षणव्यापार ... नुनासिक: is made on the शास्त्रमनपेक्षितप्रयोगम् view, then it is a different thing! — प्रतिपत्तिकाले, 'at the time of understanding' the Sū. It practically means 'theoretically'. So प्रयोगे तु is understood before रेफस्तथाभूतो.—अपराध्यति is rather a peculiar expression in this context. Literally meaning 'is at fault', it conveys something like 'is not qualified'.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 10) एवम् 'अचो रहाभ्याम्—' इत्येतदपि etc. The *Dīp.* returns to the case from where the discussion started. The passage is somewhat obscure. Firstly, what exactly is meant by the sentence : किमस्ति रेफहकारयो: etc.? The passage apparently means that in Sanskrit the combination *-rh+yar-* is impossible and so by *rahābhyām* are meant the two environments *r-yar* and *h-yar*. I do not understand what relevance this point has in the context of the present problem. Secondly, the MS यथैव यरो निवर्तिता एवं रेफोऽपि is not easy to explain. Literally it would mean : Just as the *yar* phonemes are made to

retire, so also *r*. The 'retirement' of *yar* is because of their replacement by their reduplications. But how to apply this *nivṛtti* to *r*? Or has the word निवर्तित two different meanings in the two occurrences? Since this text as it is cannot be explained satisfactorily, I follow a suggestion made to me by Pandit V. B. Bhagavat Shastri and emend यरो निवर्तिता into हकारो निवर्तितः. Here *nivartita* means excluded or ruled out. The relevant point is that *r* is excluded from undergoing the operation. (निवर्तितः = कार्यित्वात् निवर्तितः.) A similar case of exclusion in this respect is that of *h*. Exclusion from reduplication is the only similarity between the two. The causes of this exclusion are *not* identical. *R* is excluded because its *nimitta* status supersedes the *kāryin* status; *h* is excluded for the simple reason that it is not included in *yar*. The clue for this emendation is in Kaiy. who says : हकारवद्रेफोऽपि न कार्यीत्यर्थः (quoted above).

(*p*. 29, *l*. 15) दध्युदकादिषु पुनः etc. The *Dīp.* now takes the example where it was pointed out that the logic followed in the case of *madrahrada* would make the form *dadhyudaka* difficult to explain. It was maintained (Text, *p*. 28, *ll*. 15-18) that one and the same linguistic element cannot have both a *nimitta* status and a *kāryin* status; whichever is mentioned directly or specifically will supersede the one conveyed indirectly or one which is only inferential. In the case of *madrahrada*, *r* (although a *yar*) could not undergo reduplication because *r* is specifically mentioned as a *nimitta* in the rule. As against this it was argued (Text, *p*. 28, *ll*. 21-25) that the forms like *dadhyudaka* require, for ĭ, ŭ, r̥̄, ḷ, a two-fold status simultaneously. How can this form be then explained? To this the Siddhāntin had then replied, saying that two different sets of procedural principles are applied to these two kinds of form. One (for *madrahrada*) is already given and illustrated. The other, to be used for *dadhyudaka* is now given. These principles, which are exactly the opposite of the earlier ones, are :

1. व्यक्तिः पदार्थः 'An individual constitutes an entity'
2. असकृल्लक्षणं प्रवर्तते 'A rule proceeds more than once'
3. प्रतिलक्ष्यं भिन्नानि लक्षणानि ... 'Rules (although uttered only once) multiply themselves for every individual instance separately'
4. प्रयोगाङ्गं शास्त्रम् 'Grammar is subservient to linguistic usage'.

On this alternative set of principles, the rule applies, in its individual form (*śāstravyakti*), as many times as it is necessary to cover all individual targets (*lakṣyavyakti*). Therefore, in the present case, the rule *iko yaṇ aci* applies, as many times as it is necessary, so as to make *ik* phonemes not only the undergoers of operation (in which connection they are specifically mentioned), but also the condition of the operations, which status of theirs is only inferential (being part of the *ac* phonemes).

(*p*. 29, *l*. 17) अतश्च 'न वेति विभाषा' etc. Bhar. cites an example how the acceptance of one or the other of these two sets of procedural principles justifies (or makes superfluous) a rule of grammar. Pāṇini's rule 1. 1. 44 : न वेति विभाषा is necessary if you follow आकृतिः पदार्थः (and the other three principles that go with it) but unnecessary if you subscribe to व्यक्तिः पदार्थः (and the other three principles that go with it).

The term *vibhāṣā*, defined in P. 1. 1. 44 : न वेति विभाषा, is traditionally believed to apply particularly in the domain of what is known as उभयत्रविभाषा, i. e. where, in one ond the same rule, some operation which has become due in one part is to be made optionally applicable while, at the same time, the same operation which has not become due in another part is to be made optionally available. P. 6. 1. 30 : विभाषा श्वेः is the usual example. This rule teaches optional Samprasāraṇa of the root *śvi* (i. e. it becomes *śu* optionally) in the Perfect and in the Intensive. Actually the Samprasāraṇa is already due for the weak forms (i. e. before *kit* suffixes) (*śuśuvatuḥ* etc.) by P. 6. 1. 15 : वचिस्वपियजादीनां किति. If, at this stage, a simple optional Samprasāraṇa is taught for *śvi*, it will not bring about the desired result, whether you apply it injunctively (*vidhimukhena*) or prohibitively (*pratiṣedhamukhena*). Thus, if it is applied injunctively, the rule will only teach optional Samprasāraṇa in the strong (*pit*) forms (*śuśāva, śiśvāya*), but will not make it optional in the weak forms (only *śuśuvatuḥ*; not *śiśviyatuḥ*). On the other hand, if applied prohibitively, it will only make Samprasāraṇa optional in this latter environment (*śuśuvatuḥ, śiśviyatuḥ*), but will not make the Samprasāraṇa optionally available in the strong forms (only *śiśvāya*; not *śuśāva*). And a simultaneous application, both *vidhimukhena* and *pratiṣedhamukhena* is not allowed, as it goes against the unity of a sentence. So this special kind of option called *vibhāṣā* is devised, which contains prohibition + option (= *na* + *vā* in the definition). The prohibition part operates first, undoing what is already taught. Then, after this levelling, in the 2nd stage the optional part operates, teaching the operation optionally in both the environments (प्रतिषेधेन समीकृते विषये पश्चाद् विकल्पः प्रवर्तते as they say*. This results in the desired optional forms from *śvi*, both with and without Samprasāraṇa, throughout in the Perfect.

The *Dīp*. now says that this sort of *vibhāṣā* has to be resorted to only if one subscribes to the *ākṛti-padārtha* view (and the other principles which go with it). For, on this view, a single Sū. seeks to cover all the targets in a single application. So it will operate either *vidhimukhena* or *pratiṣedhamukhena*. Hence the *vibhāṣa*. If, however, the *vyakti-padārtha* view is accepted, then

* E. g. the *Kāśikā* on P. 1. 1. 44.

the rule can multiply itself into as many forms as there are individual cases to attend to and consequently apply itself either *vidhimukhena* or *pratiṣedha-mukhena* as needed in any particular case. On this view *vibhāṣā* taught in P. 1. 1. 44 becomes superfluous. Read the *Dīp.* under P. 1. 1. 44 itself : तत्र यदैवं प्रतिपत्तिः — शास्त्राकृतिर्लक्ष्याकृतौ प्रवर्तत इति, तदोभयत्रविभाषार्थं कर्तव्यो योगः। इतरथा हि 'विभाषा श्वेः' इति विभाषाशब्द एकस्मिन् वाक्यशेषे उपक्षीणो न भवति। भवति वा प्रवृत्त्यन्तरस्याभावात् उभयमसमर्थः कर्तुमिति। यदा त्वेवं मन्यसे लक्ष्यव्यक्तिषु शास्त्रव्यक्तय इति तदा एतन्निबन्धना 'विभाषा श्वेः' इति यावल्लक्ष्यं तत्समवायिनो बहून् योगान् प्रतिपद्यते इति नारब्धव्यो योगः। एतमेवार्थं प्रदर्शयता आचार्येण प्रदेशेषु भिन्नलक्षणैः शब्दैर्व्यवहारः कृतः[1] । Kaiy., as usual, puts this in a concise form thus : 'अशिष्यो वा विदितत्वात्' (वा.) वाशब्दो विकल्पे। तेनाकृतिपक्षे उभयत्रविभाषार्थं सूत्रं कर्तव्यम्। व्यक्तिपक्षे तु लक्ष्यभेदेन लक्षणभेदात् क्वचित् किंचिल्लक्षणं विधिमुखेन प्रवर्तते, क्वचिन्निषेधमुखेन प्रवर्तत इतीष्टसिद्ध्या सूत्रं न कर्तव्यमित्यर्थः।

(*p*. 29, *l*. 18) युगपल्लक्ष्ये लक्षणं प्रवर्तत इत्ययमावेद्वान्यः. The sentence is obscure to me, partly because the last part of the sentence is evidently corrupt. AL emend it to इत्ययं भवेद्वान्यः. I do not know what the emended passage is supposed to convey. Secondly, I am not quite sure whether it is connected with what follows (as it apparently seems to be) or with what precedes. — मद्रह्रदादिसिद्धिस् ... etc. The moral of the whole discussion. The *Dīp.* concludes by saying that in this way forms like *madrahrada* are established (on the *ākṛtipadārtha* view) while, on the other hand, when a rule applies to every single individual (on the *vyaktipadārtha* view) forms like *dadhyudaka* are established in a straight-forward (*prākṛti*) way. (Here also I am not very sure what exactly *tenaiva* and *prākṛtī* mean.)

In the final sentence, यद्व्योगस् is again obscure, probably due to corruption. If Bhar. is referring to the *Vār.* रेफस्य परोपदेशे ... प्रतिषेधः (which is the subject of the whole preceding discussion) as seems very probable, then he might be saying that the prohibition recommended by the *Vār.* need not be taught, since it is shown that no undesired forms result from the परोपदेश view. So it would seem that a word like प्रतिषेधस् is to be read (as presumed in the translation) in the place of यद्वयोगस्, though it is not possible on orthographical considerations alone. The same applies to पर्यनुयोगस् as reconstructed by AL.

Observations : A point regarding the substitutions discussed here still remains undecided. I mention it briefly below :

1. *Mahābhāṣya-Dīpikā*, ed. Abhyankar and Limaye, BORI., *p*. 261, *ll*. 3–8. The text quoted here is not in exactly the same form as appears there, but somewhat revised.

The *Mbh.* statement : रेफोष्मणां सवर्णाः न सन्ति has created a problem. Pat. makes that statement to show that owing to the absence of *sāvarṇya* (between *r* and *ṇ*) there is no danger of the undesired forms *स्वण् नयति and *कुण्डर् रथेन resulting and consequently Kāt.'s suggestion to frame a rule prohibiting such forms is superfluous. Now, where the *pūrvapakṣa* is set forth in the *Dīp.*, it is clearly stated that *ṇ* as a substitute becomes due (in *svar* > *svaṇ*) because the relevant rule (यरोऽनुनासिके ...) does not require that the substitute be a *savarṇa* (न ह्यस्मिन् योगे सवर्णग्रहणमस्तीति ; similarly Kaiy. : न ह्यत्र सवर्णग्रहणमस्ति.). Similarly, when Pat. gives his decision : अथ वा पुनरस्तु परोपदेशः, the *pūrvapakṣin* immediately jumps to his feet and reminds of his argument, saying : ननु चोक्तमेकत्र सावर्ण्यस्याचोदितत्वात् ... भवितव्यं रेफणकाराभ्यामिति. The *siddhāntin* in a way admits the objection (सत्यम्, एवमेतत्) and promises that the reply will be given in the course of the discussion on the third case. I have not been successful in finding out where the reply is given. Pat. seems definitely of the opinion that *sāvarṇya* is necessary for these substitutions (since he denies the possibility in the instances concerned on the ground of absence of *sāvarṇya* there), while both Bhar. and Kaiy. point out that there is no such specification in the rule. They seem to be right. But what intrigues me is that when the *pūrvapakṣin* in the *Dīp.* (and also in the *Prad.*) has stressed this point, why is the *siddhāntin* silent about it? It appears to me that both Bhar. and Kaiy. have deliberately silently ignored Pat's statement. They may have thought that Pat. was not very serious when he used the word *savarṇa* when he really wanted to say *antaratama*.

But though Bhar. and Kaiy. choose to look at the *Mbh.* in this way, Nāg. cannot. When the *Mbh.* says *savarṇa*, it must be so. As to the difficulty, viz. that that expression does not figure in the rule concerned (P. 8. 4. 45), he suggests that it can be had by splitting the word *savarṇa* in P. 8. 4. 58 and by dragging it backward in the present rule (P. 8. 4. 45) (तस्मादनुनासिकविधौ सवर्णपदापकर्षपरं भाष्यं रेफोष्मणामिति. The *Chāyā* elaborates on this, saying : 'अनुनासिक ...' इति सूत्रे 'पर' इति लुप्तषष्ठ्यन्तं पृथक् पदम्। 'सवर्णे' इति च पृथक् पदम्।). I merely draw attention to this difference of view without going deeper into it.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 28, *l.* 2) MSALSw परसवर्णग्रहणम्. Here the text should be simply सवर्णग्रहणम्. पर is out of question. See also below (Text, *l.* 11) : ननु चोक्तम्, एकत्र सावर्ण्यस्याचोदितत्वात् ... etc. Also Kaiy. : णकारोऽत्र प्राप्नोति। न ह्यत्र सवर्णग्रहणमति। How the *Dīp.* MS came to read परसवर्ण° is a mystery. (A learned miscorrection ?) — (2) (*p.* 28, *l.* 5) न dropped in MS. Sw does not read it, instead reads लोपो (नास्ति). — (3) (*p.* 28, *l.* 6) MS° नासिके चैव; AL °नासिके नैव. — (4) (*p.* 28, *ll.* 11-12) AL चोदितत्वम् (for [अ]चोदितत्वात्). — MS [अ]परनासिकस्य (for [अ]नुनासि°). Here also intrusion of पर ! — (5) (*p.* 28, *l.* 13) MS दर्यतुयोक्त; AL पर्यनुयोक्ता. — (5A) MS रेफौ (for रहौ). —

(6) (*p.* 28, *l.* 17) MS ALSw व्यवहार (for यर). See Notes. — (7) (*p.* 28, *ll.* 18-19) Sw (against the *Dīp.* MS) परिवेविषातान् (as in the Nirn. ed.). — (8) (*p.* 28, *l.* 24) MS भिन्नावेवेकाविति; Sw °वेवेता°. — (9) (*p.* 29, *l.* 1) MS (here also as in *p.* 28, *l.* 14 above) रेफौ (for रहौ). — (10) (*p.* 29, *l.* 2) For the MS रेफो संध्यमाणा नास्ति शास्त्रत्वे, see Notes. — (11) (*p.* 29, *l.* 4) MS नुटमुटौ; AL रुड्मुटौ; Sw ङुड्नुटौ. — (12) (*p.* 29, *l.* 7) AL समुदाये ना° (for °दायेना°) — MS °सिकनिमित्तमांतरतस्य; Sw °सिको निमित्तमान्तरत(स्य)स्य. — (13) (*p.* 29, *l.* 8) MS कुंडिनो. — (14) (*p.* 29, *l.* 9) MS वर्णेनातर; AL °वर्णेनान्तरेण. — (15) (*p.* 29, *l.* 10) MS अपरार्थति; AL अपदार्थ इति; Sw अपरार्था ते (?) (for °राध्यति). — (16) (*p.* 29, *l.* 13) For the MS यरो निवर्तिता, see Notes. — (17) (*p.* 29, *l.* 15) MS प्रवृत्तिः (for व्यक्तिः). — (18) (*p.* 29, *l.* 18) For the MS °मावेद्वान्यः, see Notes. — (19) (*p.* 29, *l.* 19) MS तेनेय्य°; AL तेनैषा; Sw तेनेत्य (for तेनैव). — (20) AL प्रवृत्तिः (for प्राकृती). — (21) (*p.* 29, *l.* 20) For the MS यद्वद्योगस्, see Notes.

[III]

[1]

इमे अयोगवाहाः etc. The term अयोगवाह stands for the following speech-sounds (as enumerated in the *Mbh.*): (1) विसर्जनीय, (2) जिह्वामूलीय, (3) उपध्मानीय, (4) अनुस्वार, and (5) यम. For these, see e. g. the *Kāt. Prāt.* 8. 8 ff. and the commentary of Uvaṭa thereon. For other explanations of the term अयोगवाह, see K. C. Chatterji, *Technical Terms and Technique of Sanskrit Grammar*, Calcutta 1948, pp. 215 ff.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 25) विधानादेषां साधुत्वं etc. Although not read in the Akṣaras., their correctness is guaranteed by the *Aṣṭ*. Still particular operations taught for particular groups of phonemes, which apply to the Ayogavāhas also, require that these be read in the respective places in the Akṣaras. Kaiy. says almost varbatim the same : विधानादेषां साधुत्वं स्यात्, प्रत्याहारप्रतिबद्धं तु कार्यं न प्राप्नोति.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 26) पूर्वाचार्यसंज्ञेयम् etc. The term is found used, e. g., in the *Vāj. Prāt.* 8. 24. Bhar. correctly guesses that such a long term, coming from ancient grammarians, must have an etymological significance. On this tendency of the older grammarians to use significant terms in spite of their length, as against Pāṇini's invention of use of short, artificial terms, read Trilocana's *Pañji* on the Kātantra : ननु पूर्वाचार्या अपि वैयाकरणत्वाल्लाघवमभिलपन्तः किमिति गरीयसीः स्वरादिसंज्ञाः प्रणीतवन्त इति। सत्यम्। अन्वर्थत्वात् तासामिति। अयमर्थः — द्विविधं हि लाघवं भवति। शब्दकृतमर्थकृतं चेति। तत्रार्थकृतमेव लाघवं परार्थप्रवृत्तत्वात् तेषामभीष्टम्। अतः सर्ववर्मापि तथा प्रतिपादयति। न हि वृक्षशब्दस्य वृसंकेतं क्षसंकेतं वा कृत्वा व्यवहरतो वैदग्धी काचिदस्ति। (Quoted by K. C. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 5.) On the *Mbh.* के पुनर्, Kaiy. briefly but very aptly comments as तत्स्वरूपप्रश्नः, and on कथं पुनर् as प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तप्रश्नः.

(*p*. 29, *l*. 27) यद् अयुक्ता वहन्ति etc. The compound अयोगवाह is to be evidently dissolved as नास्ति योगो येषां ते अयोगाः । वहन्ति इति वाहाः । अयोगाश्च ते वाहाश्च अयोगवाहाः । This word seems originally to belong to the life of the village agricultural community, and brings to the mind the image of a bull, who is unyoked (*ayoga* = *ayukta* as the *Mbh*. explains) and still (somehow) carries (*vāha*) a cart[1]. Figuratively, it could be used for someone carrying out a responsibility, without being officially entrusted with it. In the grammar it is used for some speech sounds not mentioned (directly or indirectly) in the Akṣaras. in spite of their being used in the language.

Bhar. explains the *Mbh*. अयुक्ता ... श्रूयन्ते in two ways. According to the first explanation, which is evidently his own, the two sentences are *two* different statements about the Ayogavāhas : (1) अयुक्ता वहन्ति, *and* (2) अनुपदिष्टाश्च श्रूयन्ते. The first sentence contrasts the Ayogavāhas with phonemes like *ā*, *ī*, etc., which also are not read in the Akṣaras., still are connected (*yukta*) with Akṣaras. These are comprehended through their counterparts either by the rule (*lakṣaṇa*) of *grahaṇa*, viz. P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित् सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः or, following Kāt., by resorting to the generality (*ākṛti*). They can undergo a grammatical operation (or be a cause of it) — *vahanti* = *kāryaṁ pratipadyante*, when thus comprehended. — यथाकारादयः = यथा आका° (which illustrates केचित् वर्णाः). The sentence is constructed rather clumsily. Something like इह केचित् वर्णा लक्षणेन वाकृत्या [वा] युक्ता वहन्ति, [नाम] कार्यं प्रतिपद्यन्ते, यथा आ° was expected. — केचित् पुनर् etc. explains अनुपदिष्टाश्च श्रूयन्ते. — Here phonemes actually read in the Akṣaras. are referred to, such as *a*, *i*. Here यथाकारादयः means यथा अका°. The two statements together mean that the Ayogavāhas are neither directly read in the Akṣaras. nor can they be understood by the methods of *grahaṇaka-śāstra*/*ākṛtigrahaṇa* (as they have no *sāvarṇya* with any of the sounds actually read, nor an *ākṛti* common to them).

(*p*. 30, *l*. 3) अथायोगवाहशब्दे ... etc. The idea is : can the name Ayogavāha be said to be significant as far as this second feature, viz. अनुपदिष्टत्व — absence of the character of being read (in the alphabet) — is concerned ? Yes. They lack the उपदेशयोग. So अयुक्ताः = अनुपदेशयोगवन्तः.

(*p*. 30, *l*. 5) अन्येषां ग्रन्थो etc. Bhar. now mentions another interpretation of *Mbh*. अनुक्ता वहन्ति, अनुपदिष्टाश्च श्रूयन्ते, given by some others. They do not look upon the two sentences as making two statements about the Ayogavāhas, but only one : the second sentence (अनुपदिष्टाश्च श्रूयन्ते) is merely a paraphrase of अयुक्ता वहन्ति. So अयुक्ताः = अनुपदिष्टाः. Of course here the form *upadeśa* has to

1. For some other similar terms, see G. B. Palsule : " A new explanation of the term Karmadhāraya ", *ABORI* XXXIII, 1952, pp. 245-250.

be understood in a wider sense : उपदेशश्च शास्त्रे लक्षणेन पाठेन वा as the *Dīp*. says. (After लक्षणेन, add आकृतिग्रहणेन वा). Kaiy. gives only this second interpretation. He adds that *ca* shows the reason. Read : उपदेशो द्विविधः, पाठो ग्रहणकशास्त्रेण प्रत्यायनं च। स च द्विधोऽप्येषां नास्तीत्यर्थः। चशब्दो हेतौ। यतोऽनुपदिष्टास्ततोऽयुक्ता इत्यर्थः। क्वचित्तु चशब्दो न पठ्यते।

It may be mentioned in passing that in the first interpretation, although the two predicates are restricted, each to its own subject, still factually both are true of both. Thus अयुक्ता वहन्ति (श्रूयन्ते च), अनुपदिष्टाश्च श्रूयन्ते (वहन्ति च).

[2]

शर्षु जश्भावषत्वे (*Vār*. 7). Bhar. skips over the *Vār*. 6 : अयोगवाहानामट्सु णत्वम् (which pleads for the reading of the Ayogavāhas in the *aṭ* group in order to facilitate *ṇ*-substitution) and passes on to the *Vār*. 7. The *Mbh*. on this runs as follows : शर्षूपदेशः कर्तव्यः। किं प्रयोजनम् ? जश्भावषत्वे। अयमुब्जिरुपध्मानीयोपधः पठ्यते। तस्य जश्त्वे कृते उब्जिता उब्जितुम् इत्येतद् रूपं यथा स्यात्।

Two purposes, it is pointed out, will be served by reading the Ayogavāhas in the *śar* group (= *ś ṣ s*), viz. (1) *jaś*- substitution and (2) cerebralization of *s*. The *Mbh*. illustrates the first purpose by the example of the root *ubj*. This root is actually read in the Dhātupāṭha as *udj*- ('*udja ārjave*' P. Dh. VI. 20). But perhaps Kāt. read it with an Upadhmānīya as its penultimate (i. e. as *u ẖ ja*). Pat. explains that with the substitution of the relevant *jaś*, i. e. *b* in the present case, taught by P. 8. 4. 53 : झलां जश् झशि, we can have forms like *ubjitā* etc.

But, it will be immediately asked, how will *śar* group help this substitution ? Pāṇini says *jhalām*, not *śarām*. (Cf. Nāg. for this objection : ननु शरां जशो भवन्तीति लक्षणाभावात् शर्षु पाठस्य न जश्भावः प्रयोजनम् ...) Anticipating such an objection the *Dīp*. says : शर्त्वदशायां झल्त्वानुरोधेन जश्त्वमुच्यते. When a sound like Upadhmānīya is read in *śar*, it automatically gets the *jhal* status also, since *śar* is a sub-group included in the larger group *jhal*. So a *jaś*-substitute can be had with the *śar* also (जश्त्वं चात्राप्युपदेशेन सिद्धम्). Still, one may further ask : Why specifically in the *śar* group ? Why not anywhere else in the *jhal* ? The reply is that *śar* status specifically is indispensable for *ṣ*-substitution. Incidentally, being a part of *jhal*, it helps *jaś*-substitution also. Hence the recommendation for reading the Ayogavāhas in *śar* specifically.

Observation : शर्त्वदशायां is our emendation for जश्त्व° of the MS (retained in the eds.). In this section the MS has made confusion between शर्, षट्, अट्, जश्, अल् etc. The eds. have made the correction only in some places.

(*p.* 30, *l.* 9) उपध्मानीयादेः. This one-word *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh.* : यद्युपध्मानीयोपधः पठ्यते, उब्जिजिषतोऽप्युपध्मानीयादेरेव द्विर्वचनं प्राप्नोति । दकारोपधे पुनर् 'न न्द्राः संयोगादयः' इति प्रतिषेधः सिद्धो भवति ।

Here it is pointed out that if the root *ubj* is accepted basically to be *uᳵj* (for whose replacement by *ubj* the previous *Vār.* pleaded the inclusion of the Ayogavāhas into *śar*, i. e. *jhal*), there will be a difficulty in some concrete forms viz. the desiderative ones. The desired form *ubjijiṣati* will not be arrived at. (The wrong form *ubibjiṣati* will result.) The *Dīp.* explains : When we are in the stage *uᳵj + iṣa*, two courses seem to be open : one, the reduplication of the desiderative stem by P. 6. 1. 9 : सन्यङोः and, two, the *jaś*-substitution (i. e *uᳵj* > *ubj*) by P. 8. 4. 53 : झलां जश् झशि. Now this *jaś*-substitution is taught in the *asiddha* section. So we may first effect reduplication. Leaving the initial *u* out of reduplication (P. 6. 1. 2 : अजादेर्द्वितीयस्य) the part which will have to be reduplicated is *-ᳵjiṣa* (उपध्मानीयादेरेव द्वित्वं प्राप्नोति as the *Mbh.* says). After all the processes of reduplication are gone through we lastly substitute *b* in the place of ᳵ, finally arriving at the wrong form (अनिष्टं रूपम्) *ubibjiṣati.* So instead of this we take the other course. Although what is taught in the *asiddha* section is technically non-existent with reference to what is taught earlier (P. 1. 1 — 8. 1), still the *Mbh.* has made an exception to this, viz. the reduplication (पूर्वत्रासिद्धीयमद्विर्वचने under P. 6. 1. 9, *Vār.* 7; III. 15. 24). So we can effect *jaś*-substitution first (*-ᳵjiṣa* > *-bjiṣa*), and then go through the process of reduplication. Still we again arrive at the wrong form *ubibjiṣati* (यदि पूर्वत्रासिद्धमद्विर्वचने अथापि पूर्वं द्विर्वचनम्, उभयथापि अनिष्टं रूपम्). So, reading the root as *uᳵj* does not lead to the correct forms even if the Upadhmānīya is read in *śar*.

On the other hand, continues the opponent, if the root is read as *udj* (as in the Dhātup.), *d* also will be kept out of reduplication by P. 6. 1. 3 : न न्द्राः संयोगादयः. The reduplication will then concern only *-jiṣa* and finally *ubjijiṣati* is arrived at.

(*p.* 30, *l.* 10) निपातनादेव सिद्धम्. But how does one get the substitution *d* > *b* in *ubjijiṣati* (or for that matter, in *ubjitum* etc.) ? The *Dīp.* has not quoted this part of the *Mbh.* which reads as follows : यदि दकारोपधः पठ्यते, का रूपसिद्धिः, उब्जिता उब्जितुमिति ? असिद्धे भ उद्जेः । इदमस्ति 'स्तोः श्चुना श्चुः' (पा. ८. ४. ४०) इति । ततो वक्ष्यामि — भ उद्जेः । उद्जेः श्चुना संनिपाते भो भवतीति । तत् तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । निपातनादेव सिद्धम् । किं निपातनम् ? 'भुजन्युब्जौ पाण्युपतापयोः' (पा. ७. ३. ६१) इति । The protagonist of the text *udj* replies by saying that after P. 8. 4. 40 : स्तोः श्चुना श्चुः he will read an additional Sū. : भ उद्जेः. With the continuation of स्तोः श्चुना from the preceding rule the new rule will mean that *stu* (i. e. *d* in the present case) of *udj* is replaced by *bh* when followed by *ścu* (here *j*). This *bh* can subsequently be replaced by *b* by P. 8. 4. 53,

But this sort of inserting an additional rule implies a defect, viz. *gaurava.* So the idea is given up and it is now suggested that P. 7. 3. 61 : भुजन्युब्जौ etc. which mentions the ready-made form *nyubja* in order to indicate the absence of velarisation ordinarily caused by the suffix *ghañ,* also serves indirectly to show that in actual form we have *b.* Thus both the objectives are achieved by this Nipātana itself (निपातनादेव सिद्धम्) : (1) presence of *b* in actual forms, and (2) by keeping *d* out of reduplication, we successfully avoid the wrong forms *ubibjiṣati* and arrive at *ubjijiṣati.*

(*p.* 30, *l.* 11) को वृत्तान्तो ... हि लिङ्गम् . This is Bhar's additional contribution to the discussion. He raises a question about reduplication. With this Nipātana now brought in, how can you arrive at the correct form *ubjijiṣati ?* Will this not land us on the wrong reduplication *ubibjiṣati ?* This is the idea behind the question : The *b*-substitution is now being sought to be achieved by means of the Nipātana, and not by any rule in the *asiddha* section. It will immediately bring in *b* in the place of *d* so that from *ubj* we again get the wrong form *ubibjiṣati.* Hence the question : what about the reduplication (को वृत्तान्तो द्विर्वचने) ? How do you keep *b* outside the reduplication ? (Cf. Kaiy's identical question : द्विर्वचनं कथम् ? and Nāg.'s pertinent comment on it : बकाररहितस्येति शेषः.)

(*p.* 30, *l.* 11) अत्रायमभिप्रायो etc. This is the reply to the above question : को वृत्तान्तो द्विर्वचने ? The idea (*abhiprāya*) is that a Nipātana is merely an indicatory sign. It is not here the actually teaching authority (न त्विदमेव प्रापकमस्त्यस्येति). He has a different provision in mind. He says that the Nipātana points to a rule like *udjeś ca dakārasya* which was left unsaid after the *Vār.* हृग्रहोर्भश्छन्दसि हस्य (*bh* replaces *h* of *hṛ* and *grah* in the Veda). The *Dīp.* says here : वाक्यशेषोऽनुमास्यते. All that Bhar. seems to mean is that an additional rule उद्जेश्च दकारस्य can be inserted after the *Vār.* : हृग्रहोर् etc. (thus sanctioning $d > bh$) which is under P. 8. 2. 32 : दादेर्धातोर्घः.

The place of the rule is significant : it is in the *asiddha* section. So the substitute *bh* will be technically non-existent as far as the reduplication (taught in Ch. VI) is concerned. The result is that at the time of reduplication the root will be regarded as *udj* itself, with *d* kept out of reduplication as said before. After the process of reduplication is complete, **udjijiṣati* is replaced by *ubjijiṣati* (through **ubhji*°).

(*p.* 30, *l.* 14) अकुत्वविषये तत् निपातनम् . This represents the following *Mbh.* इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति – अभ्युद्गः समुद्ग इति । अकुत्वविषये तन्निपातनम् । A difficulty is pointed out if the Nipātana is accepted. The words *abhyudga* and *samudga* are supposed to be derived from *abhi* + *udj* and *samudj* respectively with the

suffix *ghañ*. The final consonant *j* is replaced by *g* by P. 7. 3. 52 : चजोः कु घिण्-ण्यतोः. If the Nipātana is accepted, wrong forms will result here, **abhyubga* etc. — अकुत्वविषये etc. is the reply given. The Nipātana is not applicable where *j* has undergone a velar substitution. So *abhyudga* etc. are safe. The *Dīp*. adds that a Nipātana need not have a universal application, sometimes one can draw an inference (here $d > b(h)$) even pertaining to a specific domain. (cf. Kaiy. : विशिष्टविषयमनुमानमित्यर्थः .)

(*p*. 30, *l*. 15) गमेरेव द्युपसर्गाड्ड डः. This is an alternative to the above explanation (viz. अकुत्वविषये तन्निपातनम्). The full text of the *Mbh*. is : अथ वा, नैतदुब्जे रूपम्। गमेरेतद् द्युपसर्गाड्ड डो विधीयते। अभ्युद्गतोऽभ्युद्गः, समुद्गतः समुद्गः इति। This explanation is for those who may not recognize a *viśiṣṭaviṣaya* Nipātana. *Abhyudga* is not from *ubj* but from *abhi* + *ud* + *gam* + *a* (*ḍa*) where *gam* loses its *-am* as indicated by the code-letter *ḍ* of the suffix. — संप्रति यद्यपि निपातनादेव etc. The *Dīp*. now says that even if the Nipātana itself is regarded as the authority sanctioning the *b*-substitution, there will be no problem. For, if *b* were to come in first and find a place in the reduplication, thus resulting into a wrong form (*ubibjiṣati*), Pāṇini's aim in reading *d* will be defeated. What is then the use of reading the root artificially as *udj* instead of in the natural form *ubj* ? Pāṇini's object is clearly to keep *b* outside the reduplication by reading it artificially as *d* (thus seeking absence of its reduplication by P. 6. 1. 3 : न न्द्राः संयोगादयः) and then, only after the reduplication (of *-jiṣa-*) has taken place, to substitute it in the place of *d* (arriving at the correct form *ubjijiṣati*). So, the protagonist of *udj* continues, on the force of this reading of *d* the Nipātana teaching $d > b$, though not technically *asiddha*, will still wait for the reduplication to take place first. (See also remarks on निपातनादेव सिद्धम्। को वृत्तान्तो द्विर्वचने above, *ll*. 10–11.) Similarly Kaiy. Read : अथापि न वाक्यशेषानुमानम्, निपातनमेव प्रतिपादकम्, तथापि दकारोपदेशसामर्थ्याद् द्विर्वचने कृते दकारस्य बत्वं प्रवर्तते.

[3]

अवश्यं नुमो ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्. Having finished the discussion on *jaśbhāva*, Pat. is now discussing the other utility, viz. *ṣatva*, mentioned in the *Vār*. 7. Here is the relevant Bhāṣya : षत्वं च प्रयोजनम्। सर्पिःषु धनुःषु। शर्व्यवाय इति षत्वं सिद्धं भवति। नुम्विसर्जनीयशर्व्यवायेऽपि (पा. ८. ३. ५८) इति विसर्जनीयग्रहणं न कर्तव्यं भवति। नुमश्चापि तर्हि ग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम्। कथं सर्पीषि धनूंषि? अनुस्वारे कृते शर्व्यवाय इत्येव सिद्धम्। अवश्यं नुमो ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्।

In forms like *sarpiḥṣu*, the suffixal *s* is cerebralized by P. 8. 3. 58 : नुम्विसर्जनीय° which allows an intervention, among others, of Visarjanīya between a preceding *iṇ-ku* phoneme and the following *s* (of a suffix etc.). The same rule also teaches *ṣ*-substitution, under the same condition, even when a *śar* phoneme

intervenes. If the *Vār.* suggestion is followed and the Ayogavāhas (of which the Visarjanīya is one) are read in the *śar* group, one can dispense with the word Visarjanīya in P. 8. 3. 58. This *lāghava*, thus achieved, will be a gain.

At this stage a suggestion is put forward in the *Mbh.* Inspired by the successful doing away of Visarjanīya in P. 8. 3. 58, it is now suggested that one could similarly do away with *num* (the infix *n*) also occurring in that rule. For in cases like *sarpīṁṣi*, which require the mention of *num* in the rule, the *num* is replaced by Anusvāra which also is one of the Ayogavāhas. Ifn these latter are read in the *śar* group, *num* can be dropped from the rule without any damage, just like the Visarjanīya. But the suggestion is not accepted. The inclusion of *num* is indispensable (अवश्यं नुमो ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्).

In the *Mbh.* which follows the reason for this is given : अवश्यं नुमो ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। अनुस्वारविशेषणं नुम्-ग्रहणम्, नुमो योऽनुस्वारस्तत्र यथा स्यात्, इह मा भूत्-पुंस्विति। It is true that the *num* is going to be replaced by Anusvāra in this context (एतस्मिन्विषये नुमोऽनुस्वारेण भवितव्यम्; P. 8. 3. 24 : नश्चापदान्तस्य झलि). But the *num*, i. e. an infix *n*, is not the only source of Anusvāra. Even *m* can be a source of Anusvāra, e. g. the form *puṁsu* (Loc. pl. of *pums*). If the ṣ-substitution in *sarpīṁṣi* etc. is sought to be accounted for by the *śar* status (by including the Anusvāra, as an Ayogavāha, in *śar*), the ṣ-substitution will undesiredly apply to *puṁsu* also. So the mere inclusion of Ayogavāhas in *śar* will not do. It is here that the reading of the word *num* in the role plays its rule. It is to qualify Anusvāra. So now it means that the ṣ-substitution takes place even when there is an intervention of an *Anusvāra*, only if the *Anusvāra* has developed out of *num*. This takes care of cases like *puṁsu*.

Observations : (1) The eds. read : तत्रैवमर्थमेव नुमो ग्रहणं — यत्रैवानुस्वारस्तत्र यथा स्यादिति. Here यत्रैवानुस्वारस् is confusing. It does not convey the intended sense, viz. that intervention of only that Anusvāra is permissible for ṣ-substitution which has developed out of *num*. Inspecting the MS in this context once more, I found that there is an ink spot between वा and नु which is large enough to obliterate one letter. I have a hunch that the letter thus obliterated was स्या. Supplying it we get a good reading which gives exactly the intended meaning. In यत्रैवा[स्या]नुस्वारस्, the word अस्य means नुमः. The *Dīp.* thus is an exact paraphrase of the *Mbh.* नुमो योऽनुस्वारस्तत्र यथा स्यात्.

(2) The reading of *num* is necessary, whether one reads the Ayogavāhas in *śar* or not. If one reads them there, the reading of *num* serves as a restriction (*niyama*), thus serving to exclude cases like *puṁsu* where there will otherwise be ṣ-substitution. Cf. Kaiy : अनुस्वारस्य शर्त्वात् तद्व्यवाये षत्वे सिद्धे नुम्-ग्रहणं नियमार्थम्—नुमो योऽनुस्वारस्तत्र यथा स्यात्, अन्यत्र मा भूत्—पुंस्विति. If on the other hand the

Ayogavāhas are not read in the *śar*, the reading of *num* is for prescription (*vidhi*). On both alternatives, the reading of *num* stands (तस्मात् नुमो ग्रहणमवस्थितम्).

[4]

अथ वाविशेषेणोपदेशः कर्तव्यः. This is Pat's introduction to the next *Vār.* (8): अविशेषेण संयोगोपधासंज्ञालोऽन्त्यद्विर्वचनस्थानिवद्भावप्रतिषेधाः, which is the last one in this section and states Kāt's final view in the matter. Although in the previous *Vār*-s Kāt. said that the Ayogavāhas should be read in the *aṭ* group of phonemes for certain purpose, and in *śar* for another purpose, he now says, to follow Bhar's interpretation, that not only for the purposes which are mentioned, but for many others such as the name *saṁyoga* etc., the Ayogavāhas should be read suitably either in *aṭ* or *śar*. It is not necessary to mention the purpose every time. *All* possible purposes can be served by reading the *Ayogavāhas* either in *aṭ* or in *śar* as necessary.

(*p.* 30, *l.* 22) नैतदनेनोच्यते, अड्भ्यः शर्भ्योऽन्यत्रापि ... etc. Bhar. is clearing a very likely misunderstanding about the meaning of the word *aviśeṣeṇa* 'without any specification; in a general way' in the *Vār*. This word does *not* refer, he says, to the place, i. e. the Śiva-sū. for reading the Ayogavāhas — it does not mean आक्षरसमाम्नायिकं सूत्रविशेषम् अनपेक्ष्य. It means प्रयोजनविशेषम् अनपेक्ष्य. (cf. Nāg.: 'अविशेषेण' इति भाष्यस्य प्रयोजनविशेषनिर्देशं विनेत्यर्थ इति भावः।) So the *Dīp.* says (that by *viśeṣa*) प्रयोजनगतो विशेष उदाह्रियते. The अविशेषप्रयोजनs — i. e. the purposes which do not require any specific Śiva-sū. — like the name *saṁyoga* — can be well served by reading the Ayogavāhas suitably in *aṭ* or *śar*. — The *Dīp.* शर्पूदेशादेव हलत्वम् etc. illustrates how the name *saṁyoga* can be had (for ᳲ*j*- in *ubjakaḥ*) which, as the *Mbh.* explains, leads, through the name *guru* for the preceding vowel, ultimately to Pluta. — The MS स्तोवति is corrupt and nothing can be made of it. Also, I read अट्सु चाल्व of the MS as अट्सु चाल्त्वम्.

[5]

निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीति. The *Vār*. mentions *alo'ntya* as one of the purposes. The rule P. 1. 1. 52: अलोऽन्त्यस्य says that a substitute taught for a word mentioned in Genitive replaces its final *al*. The *Mbh.* is here considering this utility. It reads: अलोन्त्यविधिः प्रयोजनम्। वृक्षस्तरति। प्लक्षस्तरति। अलोऽन्त्यस्य विधयो भवन्तीत्यलोऽन्त्यस्य सत्वं सिद्धं भवति। एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम्। निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीति विसर्जनीयस्यैव भविष्यन्ति।

P. 8. 3. 34: विसर्जनीयस्य सः teaches substitution of *s* in the place of the Visarjanīya when a *khar* phoneme follows. In the situation वृक्षः+तरति, the final form वृक्षस्तरति is expected. The utility is illustrated on the understanding

that *padasya* is continued in this rule (8. 3. 34). With this *anuvṛtti*, the rule, as completed by the metarule P. 1. 1. 52 means : The final *al* of a *pada* ending in Visarjanīya (P. 1. 1. 72 : येन विधिस्तदन्तस्य) is replaced by *s*. Now by this rule the *visarjanīya* of *vṛkṣaḥ* can be replaced by *s* only if it (*visarjanīya*) can be technically called *al*. Such a nomenclature requires reading of the Ayogavāhas (of which Visarjanīya is one) somewhere in the Akṣaras. (i. e. either in *aṭ* or in *śar*).

This utility is refuted by the *Mbh.* (एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम्) on the basis of the metarule निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्ति. What is meant is that the metarule *alo'ntyasya* applies where the exact word-element to be replaced (*sthānin*) is not mentioned. Where, however, it is mentioned (*nirdiśyamāna*), the Pari. *alo'ntyasya* has no business to come in. A Pari. is, after all, *aniyame niyamakāriṇī*. In the present case, since the Visarjanīya is expressly mentioned as the item to be replaced, there is no *aniyama*. Since the Pari. is not expected to step in, it does not matter whether the Visarjanīya is technically called *al* or not.

यथा वैयाघ्रपद्यः. This word *vaiyāghrapadya* illustrates the application of the Pari. निर्दिश्यमानस्य etc. The word is a patronymic derived from *vyāghrapād* with the suffix *-ya*(*ñ*) by P. 4. 1. 105 : गर्गादिभ्यो यञ्. The *vyāghrapād* itself is derived from *vyāghra* (where the final *a* is dropped by P. 5. 4. 138 : पादस्य लोपोऽहस्त्यादिभ्यः) + *pāda* in the sense व्याघ्रस्येव पादावस्य. Now when the suffix *-ya* is added to this stem *vyāghrapād* (P. 4. 1. 105), the rule P. 6. 4. 130 : पादः पद् steps in, which teaches substitution of *pad* in the place of *pād* when this latter is the end-part of an *aṅga* with the designation *bha*. Now the question is which word element exactly is to be replaced by *pad* ? There is no question of the final phoneme (*d*) being replaced by *alo'ntyasya* as the substitute consists of many phonemes (*anekāl*) and so the whole original (*sarva-*) has to be replaced (P. 1. 1. 55). The Sū. itself mentions *pād*. But the metarule येन विधिस्तदन्तस्य (P. 1. 1. 72) can come in, in which case the whole compound expression *vyāghrapād* will have to be replaced. It is also to be noted that *pād* has no independent existence, since its very formation implies that it is the final member of a compound. This being the case it almost looks that the whole compound *vyāgrapād* will have to go, when the Pari. निर्दिश्यमानस्य etc. steps in. So, since *pādaḥ* is specifically mentioned, the element *pād* alone is replaced which gives (after the insertion of *ai* between *v* and *y*, P. 7. 3. 3 : न य्वाभ्यां etc.) finally the form *vaiyāghrapadya*. Cf. the *Kāś*. (on P. 6. 4. 130) : पादः इति पादशब्दो लुप्ताकारो गृह्यते। तदन्तस्याङ्गस्य भस्य पत् इत्ययमादेशो भवति। स च 'निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्ति' इति पाच्छब्दस्यैव भवति, न तदन्तस्य सर्वस्य। ... वैयाघ्रपद्यः। On this the *Nyāsa* : पादशब्दस्य समास एवाकारो लुप्यते, तेन सामर्थ्यात् तदन्तस्याङ्गस्य कार्यं विज्ञायत इत्याह — तदन्तस्याङ्गस्येत्यादि । यदि तर्हि पाच्छब्दान्तस्याङ्गस्य पदित्ययमादेशो विज्ञायेत एवं तर्हि 'येन विधिस्तदन्तस्य' इति सर्वस्य तदन्तस्य प्राप्नोतीत्याह — स चेत्यादि ।

[6]

द्विर्वचनम् — उरःकेण. If Visarga (which is one of the Ayogavāhas) is read in the Akṣaras. (say in *śar*), it could be technically called *yar* and then by P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च, we can optionally have a form with two Visargas (*uraḥḥka*).

श्रुतिभेदमध्यवसायोच्यते. Actually it is difficult to say whether it is possible to utter two consecutive Visargas and, if so, whether there will be any difference in the auditory perception of the two Visargas. The *Dīp.* says that Kāt. has mentioned this utility on the view that there is a difference in the auditory perception of the two. Nāg.'s remark is more interesting. He says : विसर्गजिह्वामूलीयादेर्द्विरुच्चारणे विशेषस्याग्रहात्, उच्चारणस्य कर्तुमशक्यत्वाच्च, शास्त्रप्राप्तिमात्रेणैतत्प्रयोजनकथनमिति संतोष्टव्यम्.

Note : उरःकेण seems to be a scribal error under the influence of उरःकेण which occurs two lines later in the *Mbh.* उरःकः is the proper *pratīka*.

[7]

व्यूढोरस्केन. This illustrates the स्थानिवद्भावप्रतिषेध utility. In this word *s* has replaced Visarga (P. 8. 3. 38 : सोऽपदादौ). A substitute is ordinarily like the original which it replaces (P. 1. 1. 56 : स्थानिवदादेशोऽनल्विधौ). So *s* is like the Visarga and consequently there will be *ṇ*-substitution (**vyūḍhoraskeṇa*), just as it is in *urḥkeṇa*. This undesired *ṇ*-substitution can be prevented on the strength of the proviso : अनल्विधौ, as *ṇ*-substitution is an *al-vidhi* (a phonetic operation). The reading of the *visarga* (along with the other Ayogavāhas) in the alphabet, in the *aṭ* group, will be useful in giving the required *al*-status to the Visarga.

अटि विशेषे सामान्यमल्त्वमस्ति. The *aṭ*-status (necessary in the case of the Visarga for *ṇ*-substitution) implies *al*-status also (which is wider than the former). Thus the *al*-status, at the same time, is useful in prohibiting the *ṇ* substitution in *vyūḍhoraskeṇa* etc.).

तत्र नास्ति स्थानिवद्भावः. This is embedded in the rule itself : स्थानिवदादेशोऽनल्विधौ.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 29, *l.* 22) MS प्रत्याहारेर्द्वन्न; AL °रे तावन्न (for °रेऽन्यवन्न as in Sw). — (2) (*p.* 29, *l.* 25) AL एषां (for एतेषां). — (3) (*p.* 29, *l.* 26) Sw महती च सूर्नूनम्. — (4) (*p.* 30, *l.* 1) MS ए; ALSw एवं (for ए[ते]). — (5) ALSw वायुक्ता (for वा यु°). — (6) (*p.* 30, *l.* 4) MS उपयोगो (for उपदेशयोगो as rightly reconstructed by the eds.). — (7) (*p.* 30, *l.* 8) MS ALSw जड्त्व- (for शर्त्व-). — (*p.* 30, *l.* 9) ALSw त्वत्रापि (for चात्रापि). — (8) (*p.* 30, *l.* 12) MS तत्रैत्; AL तत्रैवं; Sw तत्रै(त)त् (for नैतत्). — (9) MS ALSw अन्येनास्य (for अने°).

— (10) (*p.* 30, *l.* 13) Sw ननु (for न तु). — (11) (*p.* 30, *l.* 14) MSSw प्रायकस्यस्त्यस्येति; AL प्रापकं स्वरूपस्येति. — (12) तत् is not read in the Nirṇ. editions also. — (13) (*p.* 30, *l.* 15) Sw (unnecessary) कल्प्यते (for लभ्यते). — (14) Ed. एतद् (for एष). — (15) (*p.* 30, *l.* 19) MS यत्रवा × नु°; ALSw यत्रैवानु°. — (16) (*p.* 30, *l.* 20) AL -मात्रं. — (17) (*p.* 30, *l.* 22) Sw अन्येन (for अनेन). — (18) (*p.* 30, *l.* 24) MS प्रयोजन इति; ALSw °जने इति. — (19) AL च उप- (for चेदुप-). — (20) (*p.* 30, *l.* 25), Sw अद्सूप- (for शर्पूप-). — (21) (*p.* 30, *l.* 26) MSSw चाल्व; AL च णत्वम् (for चाल्त्वम्). — (22) (*p.* 31, *l.* 3) Sw अल्विशेषे (for अटि वि°). — (23) (*p.* 31, *l.* 4) MS अगृवियंस्; AL अड्विषय:; Sw अण्विषयं (for अल्विषयम्).

[IV]

[1]

The topic discussed here is whether phonemes have any meaning, *qua* phonemes.

(*p.* 31, *l.* 6) The statement वर्णा अर्थवन्तः is thus put in the logical form by Nāg. : 'वर्णाः' इति पक्षः। पक्षतावच्छेदकत्वमेव हेतुः। धातुप्रातिपदिकेत्यादिस्तु दृष्टान्तः।

(*p.* 31, *l.* 6) सति निमित्ते प्रयोजने च .... The *nimitta* for the question, as the *Dīp.* clarifies, is the limits of *pratyakṣa* in this matter, as elsewhere, and the necessity of its being supplemented by *anumāna*. The *prayojana* is the necessity of finding out ways and means of preventing case-endings after phonemes if they are ultimately regarded as being meaningful. Kaiy. does not speak of the *nimitta*. About the *prayojana*, he succinctly says : पक्षद्वयेऽपि प्रतिवर्णं विभक्त्यनुत्पत्तिज्ञानं विचारस्य प्रयोजनम्। (Nāg. अनुत्पत्तिज्ञानम् = अनुत्पत्त्युपायज्ञानम्)

(*p.* 31, *l.* 9) वृक्षादिषु = वृक्षादिशब्देषु. समुदायेषु = वर्णसमुदायेषु.

(*p.* 31, *l.* 10) अनुमानादस्तित्वमवस्थाप्यते. The *Vār*-s 9–12 contain the logical reasons leading to the inference : वर्णा अर्थवन्तः. — यथानुपलभ्यमानायाः ... etc. The illustration is taken from the *Bhāṣya* on the *Nyāyasūtra* 1. 1. 5, see the Notes (*p.* 250, *ll.* 1–4).

(*p.* 31, *l.* 16) अर्थवत्ता च व्याकरणे ... अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां ... etc. Cf. the *Mbh.* (on P. 1. 2. 45, *Vār.* 9); सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्? अन्वयाद् व्यतिरेकाच्च। कोऽसावन्वयो व्यतिरेको वा? इह वृक्ष इत्युक्ते कश्चिच्छब्दः श्रूयते, वृक्षशब्दोऽकारान्तः सकारश्च प्रत्ययः। अर्थोऽपि कश्चिद् गम्यते मूलस्कन्धफलपलाशवानेकत्वं च। वृक्षावित्युक्ते कश्चिच्छब्दो हीयते कश्चिदुपजायते कश्चिदन्वयी। सकारो हीयत औकार उपजायते वृक्षशब्दोऽकारान्तोऽन्वयी। अर्थोऽपि कश्चिद्धीयते कश्चिदुपजायते कश्चिदन्वयी। एकत्वं हीयते द्वित्वमुपजायते मूलस्कन्धफलपलाशवानन्वयी। ते मन्यामहे यः शब्दो हीयते तस्यासावर्थो योऽर्थो हीयते, यः शब्द उपजायते तस्यासावर्थो योऽर्थ उपजायते, यः शब्दोऽन्वयी तस्यासावर्थो योऽर्थोऽन्वयी (I. 219. 20–27).

(*p*. 31, *l*. 18) प्रातिपादिकसंज्ञा by P. 1. 2. 45 : अर्थवदधातुरप्रत्ययः प्रातिपदिकम्. स्वाद्युत्पत्तिः by P. 4. 1. 1 : ङ्याप्-प्रातिपदिकात्.

(*p*. 31, *l*. 18) अर्थवत्ता वर्णानां ... etc. On the view that the meaningfulness of the phonemes is inferential, the *Dīp*. gives three alternative views on the relation of the meanings of phonemes with that of the whole (Pada etc.) : (1) The meanings of phonemes are entirely unconnected with that of the whole, like the properties of the ingredients of liquor (सुराङ्गवत्).[1] (2) There is a correlation between the meanings of phonemes and the different aspects of the whole. (3) Each single phoneme, in company with others, conveys the meaning of the whole. (There is no difference between the meaning of phonemes and that of the Pada.) With this third alternative, cf. *Vākyap*. 2. 62 :

सूक्ष्मं ग्राह्यं यथान्येन संसृष्टं सह गृह्यते ।
वर्णोऽप्यन्येन वर्णेन संबद्धो वाचकस्तथा ॥

[2. 1]

The full text of the *Vār*. 9 is : अर्थवन्तो वर्णा धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययनिपातानामेकवर्णानामर्थदर्शनात्. The four *Vār*-s (9–12; in 2. 1–4) give different arguments in favour of the view अर्थवन्तो वर्णाः. The *Mbh*. illustrates the meaningfulness of one-phoneme roots etc. thus :

धातव एकवर्णा अर्थवन्तो दृश्यन्ते — एति, अध्येति, अधीते । प्रातिपदिकानि ... आभ्याम्, एभिः, एषु । प्रत्ययाः ... औपगवः, कापटवः । निपाताः ... अ अपेहि, इ इन्द्रं पश्य, उ उत्तिष्ठ ...।

(*p*. 31, *l*. 25) ... किमत्र दर्शनं हेतुः ... etc. Bhar. points out that there is no stress on *darśanam*. The being one and being a phoneme (एकत्वे सति वर्णत्वम् – we may say) determines meaningfulness. Just as this oneness combined with phonemeness is seen to be invariably associated with meaning in *e-ti*, *ā-bhyām* etc., so must the phonemes in *vṛkṣa* also, which possess oneness and phonemeness, be meaningful. Bhar. repeats here : अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां ह्यर्थो दृश्यते.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 1) The MS reads स अयं तावत्वेतधर्मो which is evidently corrupt. AL reconstruct सार्थवत्ता चेतनधर्मः which rather appears to be a tall claim, besides being irrelevant in the present context. I tentatively emend °त्वेत° into °वर्ण°.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 1) Here also AL unnecessarily emend the simple [अ]र्थात्मा केनचित् धर्मेणा° into [अ]र्थात्मकेन चिद्धर्मेणा°. The point made by the *Dīp*. here is that there is a definite relationship of compatibility or otherwise between an object and a property. If an atom is incapable of direct perception, it is everywhere so, no matter what substance an atom belongs to. On the other hand, if

1. On this, see the *Vār*. 11 on P. 1. 2. 45.

a single phoneme is capable of being meaningful (in roots, suffixes etc.), it must have some meaning in *vṛkṣa* etc. also. The only difference is that in some cases the meaningfulness of an isolated phoneme (*kevalasya*) may be perceived (as in roots etc.); in others (*vṛkṣa* etc.) a phoneme requires (*sāpekṣasya*) company of others for its meaningfulness to be known.

(*p.* 32, *l.* 3) प्रतिपाद्यमानेन धर्मेण=अर्थवत्त्वेन. [अ]सापेक्षस्य (in *l.* 4) is my emendation for सापेक्षस्य. After this कदाचिच्च न is understood.

Observation : Nāg. here makes an observation which is not found in the ancients like Bhar. and Kaiy. He says that the concept of meaningfulness of phonemes (based on what is called *varṇasphoṭa*) is really useful in grammatical analysis only (in explaining the grammatical meanings) and that the penetration of this concept in the ordinary linguistic usage is due to the influence of the grammatical practice. Read : भाष्ये धातत्र इत्यादि प्रक्रियाश्रयप्रकृतिप्रत्ययानां वाचकत्व-मित्येवंरूपवर्णस्फोटाश्रयेण। अयं च शास्त्रव्यवहारमात्रोपयोगी। एतद्वासनावशादेव लोकव्यवहारेऽपि शास्त्रज्ञास्तथा व्यवहरन्ति, धर्मे चैवंविधज्ञानस्योपयोग इति बोध्यम्।

[2. 2]

The *Vār.* वर्णव्यत्यये चार्थान्तरगमनात् contains another kind of *anvaya-vyatireka* viz. that with a change of phoneme there is a corresponding change of meaning. The *Mbh.* explains this with three words which form minimal pairs viz. *kūpa* 'a well', *sūpa* 'soup', *yūpa* 'a sacrificial post'. Read : कूप इति सककारेण कश्चिदर्थो गम्यते। सूप इति ककारापाये सकारोपजने चार्थान्तरं गम्यते। यूप इति ककारसकारापाये यकारोपजनेऽर्थान्तरं गम्यते। ते मन्यामहे यः कूपे कूपार्थः स ककारस्य, यः सूपे सूपार्थः स सकारस्य, यो यूपे यूपार्थः स यकारस्येति।

(*p.* 32, *l.* 5) यथा राजव्यत्यय इति ... etc. The *Dīp.* here makes it clear that the word *vyatyaya* here is not to be understood in the usual sense of 'mutual interchange' (e. g. A taking the place of B, and B taking the place of A) but in the simple sense of something (A) going and something else (B) taking its place. The parallel given in the *Dīp.* is the word *rājavyatyaya* which means departure of one king and coming in of another. Bhar's meaning becomes clear when we read Nāg. who introduces Kaiy's comment : एकस्य वर्णस्याभ्युपगमेऽन्यस्या-पगमो व्यत्ययः with the words : ननु कूपादौ न सिंहादाविव वर्णव्यत्ययोऽत आह — एकस्येति।

(*p.* 32, *l.* 7) इहार्थवतामुपगमापगमाभ्याम् ... etc. The *Dīp.* gives a parallel where the variable elements are known to be meaningful. In *anuloma* 'favourable' and *pratiloma* 'opposed', the second element (-*loma*) is fixed. The change in the meaning of whole compounds therefore must be due to the change of the initials element *anu* and *prati*. And these latter are admittedly meaningful. Similarly in *kūpa*, *sūpa* and *yūpa*, where the element -*ūpa* is common, the change in meaning of the whole words must be due to the change in initial

phonemes *k*, *s*, *y* which, consequently, must be meaningful. What is itself without a meaning cannot bring about a change of meaning by its departure or coming in.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 12) The variant reading सककारस्य mentioned in the *Dīp*. should evidently qualify समुदायस्य understood. Although this does not deprive the phoneme completely of its meaning, it does weaken the case of the view वर्णा अर्थवन्तः to some extent.

[2. 3]

The *Vār*. (11) वर्णानुपलब्धौ चानर्थगतेः puts forward one more *anvayavyatireka* : If a phoneme is not there, the corresponding meaning also is not cognized. The *Mbh*. illustrates this by two examples. One pair is of *vṛkṣa* 'tree' and *ṛkṣa* 'a star', the other is of *kāṇḍīra* 'a bowman' and *āṇḍīra* (?). The meaning of the word *vṛkṣa* is not cognized by *ṛkṣa*, when *v* is removed. The *Mbh*. reads : वृक्ष इति सवकारेण कश्चिदर्थो गम्यते, ऋक्ष इति वकारापाये सोऽर्थो न गम्यते । ... etc.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 14) इहार्थवतोऽनुपलब्धौ ... etc. Here also, as in the preceding case, the *Dīp*. gives parallel illustrations of such parts of words as are known to be meaningful : *pibati* and *vipibati*, *tiṣṭhati* and *pratiṣṭhate*.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 18) सर्वे वर्णाः सर्वाभिधानशक्तियुक्ताः. If all phonemes have all-expressive powers, why cannot *pibati* express the meaning of *vipibati* ? The reply is given in the following lines : तेषां तु तस्यां तस्यामानुपूर्व्यां ... etc.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 20) 'अनर्थगतेः' इति चासमर्थसमासः. In *anarthagateḥ* (< *nañ* + *artha* + *gati*) as meaning *arthasya agateḥ*, the *nañ* is semantically connected with *gati*. Its compounding with *artha* is there inspite of the absence of semantic connection (*asamartha*-).

(*p*. 32, *l*. 21) °गमाविह त्वपायमात्रमेवेति is my reconstruction of the MS °गमादिहत्ययावतिवमात्रमेवेति. The *Dīp*. here is bringing out the difference of the present situation from that of the preceding one (अस्य पूर्वस्मादेव विशेषः). In the preceding case (2. 2) there was the loss of one phoneme and the advent of another. (अपायोपगमौ evidently refers to phonemes.) In the present case what happens is that there is simply a loss (*apāyamātram*) of a phoneme; nothing comes in its place.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 21) किं तर्हि उच्यते 'ऽनर्थगतेः' इति etc. The *Mbh*. continues its discussion of the expression *anarthagateḥ* with a view to finally showing that it is practically equivalent to *atadarthagateḥ*. So an alleged discrepancy between the *Vār*. and the *Mbh*. is attacked. While explaining *anarthagateḥ* the *Mbh*.

said : सोऽर्थो न गम्यते '*that* (i. e. the old or previous) meaning is not understood '. When you say ' that ', you practically admit that some *other* meaning is understood (अर्थान्तरं तु गम्यते. Here तु is my emendation for न of the MS[1]). Then why do you say that ' meaning is not understood (अर्थस्यागतेः) ' ?

(*p*. 32, *l*. 23) न साधीय इति. The *Mbh.* says that not only is the statement ' meaning is not understood ' far from truth, actually the meaning understood is quite ' better '. The *Dīp.* remarks that the use of the comparative degree (*sādhīyas*) is a popular idiom (लौकिकी वाचोयुक्तिः). It probably here denotes a deliberate exaggeration. I do not know how exactly the expression is to be understood as a *laukikī vācoyukti.* The *Dīp*'s illustration : तद्यथा । कश्चित् कंचिदाह — किमनेन गतेन ? नायं करिष्यति etc. is almost repeated verbatim in the *Prad.* Read : यथा ' न किंचिदयं तत्र करोति ' इत्युक्ते कश्चिदाह ' सुतरामयं करोति ' इति ।

(*p*. 32, *l*. 25) तस्यार्थस्तदर्थः and सोऽर्थस्तदर्थः. The *Mbh.* reads : एवं तर्हीदं पठितव्यं स्यात् ' वर्णानुपलब्धौ चातदर्थगतेः ' इति । किमिदमतदर्थगतेरिति । तस्यार्थस्तदर्थः । तदर्थस्य गतिस्तदर्थगतिः, न तदर्थगतिरतदर्थगतिः, अतदर्थगतेरिति । अथ वा सोऽर्थस्तदर्थः, तदर्थस्य गतिस्तदर्थगतिः ... etc. In तस्यार्थः, तस्य = तस्य शब्दस्य (as Bhar. says) i. e. तस्य वर्णस्य as Kaiy. says more specifically. अथ मन्यसे ... introduces an objection against the interpretation (of *tadartha*) as *tasya arthaḥ.* The meaningfulness of a phoneme is still in question. It is being still investigated. How can the opponent take it for granted and speak of *tasya* (*varṇasya*) *arthaḥ* ? So the second interpretation — *so 'rthaḥ* is advanced. For the objection just mentioned, cf. Kaiy. : परं प्रति वर्णानामर्थवत्त्वमसिद्धमिति कथं ' तस्य ' इति वर्णः परामृश्यत इत्याह सोऽर्थ इति ।

(*p*. 33, *l*. 2) अत्र नोष्ट्र एव मुखं संभवतीति ... etc. The *Mbh.* reads : स हि तथा निर्देशः (i. e. अतदर्थगतेः instead of अनर्थगतेः) कर्तव्यः । न कर्तव्यः । उत्तरपदलोपोऽत्र द्रष्टव्यः । तद्यथा — उष्ट्रमुखमिव मुखमस्य उष्ट्रमुखः । खरमुखः । एवमतदर्थगतेरनर्थगतेरिति ।

According to this *Mbh.* the expression *an-arthagati* is equivalent to *a-*(*tad-*) *arthagati,* with a *tad* supposed to be deleted (or rather not used at all) after *nañ.* It is like *uṣṭramukha* ' having a face like that of a camel ' which is supposed to represent *uṣṭramukhamukha,* one *mukha* being deleted by the *Vār.* (12) *saptamyupamāna°* on P. 2. 2. 24.

The *Dīp.* अत्र नोष्ट्र एव मुखं संभवतीति ... etc. is supposed to explain the above *Mbh.* The passage however is not quite clear. There are two difficulties with the first sentence : अत्र नोष्ट्र एव मुखं संभवतीति इवशब्दो निवर्तते. Firstly the word *iva* does not appear in a compound. Its absence in a compound does not need

1. This is confirmed by Kaiy. who has exactly the same sentence. Read ; प्रकृतार्थो न गम्यते, अर्थान्तरं तु गम्यत इत्यर्थः ।

any explanation. So अत्र नोष्ट्र ... भवतीति cannot be its explanation. Secondly, one expected that the sentence अत्र नोष्ट्र ... भवतीति should be followed by some such words as उष्ट्रशब्दः उष्ट्रावयवे लाक्षणिको गृह्यते which would convey the idea that since a camel cannot obviously be a face of a person, the word *uṣṭra* has to be understood in a figurative sense, say as being equivalent to *uṣṭra-mukha*. But no words to this effect appear in the text. (Instead we have the incongruous expression following, viz. इवशब्दो निवर्तते. Or is any part of the text lost in between ?) — After नान्यत्र अवयवये वृत्तः (line 3) किं तु मुख एव is to be understood. The *Dīp*. seems to say that since *uṣṭra* conveys, by itself, the meaning 'a camel's face' by Lakṣaṇā, a simple *uṣṭra-mukha* is used instead of *uṣṭramukhamukha*. (अन्यत्र अवयवे = अन्यस्मिन् अव° पादादौ.) Cf. the maxim उक्तार्थानामप्रयोगः. — The next sentence also is not quite clear to me. It seems to answer a possible question : But what is the objective criterion to decide where and where alone *uṣṭra* is to be understood as being equivalent to *uṣṭramukha* ? The reply is : only when a word *mukha* (denoting the face of the *upameya*, of course) follows. In this sentence also there is a lacuna. After स च समुदायशब्दो some such words as मुखे रूढः (or लाक्षणिकः) have to be understood. — नान्यत्र अवयवे is परसप्तमी ('not when a word expressive of any other limb follows'). — प्रकृतार्थे = प्रक्रान्तार्थे. तस्य = 'तत्' शब्दस्य. अनभिधानम् = अप्रयोगः. तत्रैव = तस्मिन्नेव अर्थे. This is explained by तच्छब्दार्थमुपादाय. As usual, Kaiy. is clear. Read : उष्ट्रमुख इति। गतार्थत्वादप्रयोग एव द्वितीयमुखशब्दस्य लोपोऽभिधीयते। अत्र हि उष्ट्रो मुखमस्येत्येव विग्रहः। न च प्राणी प्राण्यन्तरस्य मुखं भवतीति विशिष्टावयववृत्तिरुष्ट्रशब्दः सादृश्यान्मुखं विशिनष्टि। एवमिहाप्यनर्थगतेरित्यत्रार्थशब्देन प्रक्रान्तोऽर्थ उच्यते, नार्थमात्रमित्यर्थः।

[2. 4]

The *Mbh*. on the *Vār*. (12) संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्च runs thus : संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्च मन्यामहेऽर्थवन्तो वर्णा इति। येषां संघाता अर्थवन्तोऽवयवा अपि तेषामर्थवन्तः। तद्यथा — एकश्चक्षुष्मान् दर्शने समर्थस्तत्समुदायश्च शतमपि समर्थम्। एकश्च तिलस्तैलदाने समर्थस्तत्समुदायश्च खार्यपि तैलदाने समर्था। येषां पुनरवयवा अनर्थकाः, समुदाया अपि तेषामनर्थकाः। तद्यथा — एकोऽन्धो दर्शनेऽसमर्थस्तत्समुदायश्च शतमप्यसमर्थम्। एका च सिकता तैलदानेसमर्था, तत्समुदायश्च खारीशतमप्यसमर्थम्।

The line of argument is like this : A whole derives its properties from those of its constituents. Whatever properties there are in the constituents will pass on into the whole. A whole cannot have properties which are not there in the constituents. So if a whole is seen to have a property, we can draw inference that the constituent also must have that property. In the present case, if a whole like the word *vṛkṣa* is seen to have some meaning, that meaning must be there in the constituents (*v-ṛ-* etc.) So *arthavanto varṇāḥ*.

In the *Dīp.* (line 6) the sentence दर्शनमदर्शनं च हेतुः can be thus explained : समुदाये कस्यचिद्धर्मस्य दर्शनमवयवे तस्य धर्मस्य सत्तानुमाने हेतुः। समुदाये च कस्यचिद्धर्मस्यादर्शनमवयवे तस्य धर्मस्य सत्ताया अभावानुमाने हेतुः।

(*p.* 33, *l.* 7) अनेकवर्णोच्चारणे तु ... etc. Although every phoneme (*v*, *ṛ*, etc.) contains the meaning in full, the utterance of all the phonemes (*v-ṛ-k-ṣ-a*) is necessary to make the mind of the listener mature to grasp the meaning.

[3]

यदि तर्हि इमे वर्णाः ... etc. Having pleaded for the meaningfulness of phonemes, the *Mbh.* now points out the undesirable consequences of this view. The *Mbh.* runs thus : यदि तर्हीमे वर्णा अर्थवन्तः, अर्थवत्कृतानि प्राप्नुवन्ति। कानि। 'अर्थवत् प्रातिपदिकम्' इति प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा, 'प्रातिपदिकात्' इति स्वाद्युत्पत्तिः, 'सुबन्तं पदम्' इति पदसंज्ञा। तत्र को दोषः? 'पदस्य' इति नलोपादीनि प्राप्नुवन्ति। धनं वनमिति।

It is pointed out here that the meaningfulness of phonemes, if admitted, will lead to their nomenclature *prātipadika* by P. 1. 2. 45 : अर्थवदधातुरप्रत्ययः प्रातिपदिकम्; this, in turn, will lead to case-endings following after the phonemes by P. 4. 1. 1 : ङ्याप्-प्रातिपदिकात्. Of course this in itself is not a serious danger, as Bhar. himself points out further on, as the case-endings are going to be deleted anyway by P. 2. 4. 71 : सुपो धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः. But the mischief will have been done. For even after their deletion the case endings will remain effective by P. 1. 1. 62 : प्रत्ययलोपे प्रत्ययलक्षणम्, so that there will be the nomenclature *pada* for the phonemes. Under these circumstances, when a phoneme is called both a *pada* and a *prātipadika*, P. 8. 2. 7 : नलोपः प्रातिपदिकान्तस्य (which means प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञकं यत् पदं तदन्तस्य नकारस्य लोपः स्यात्) operates with the result that the consonant *n* in words like *dhana*, *vana* etc. faces the threat of deletion.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 10) प्रयोगेऽर्थवत्तायां सत्यां न दोषोऽस्ति etc. Bhar. points out that this will not create any difficulties in communication, because the case endings, if they come in, will be deleted (विभक्तेर्लुका भवितव्यम्). This is so because, like the individual phonemes, the whole word also will get the name *prātipadika*. This *prātipadika* will include within it the case-endings which will come after the phonemes. Being a part of the whole-word-*prātipadika*, they will be deleted by P. 2. 4. 71 : सुपो धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः (= धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः अवयवस्य सुपो लुक् स्यात्). Though thus harmless as far as the usage is concerned, the case-endings will create a problem for grammar (शास्त्रे तु किंचिद् विनश्यति) for which some solution will have to be found out. The problem is of course a threat to the existence of *n* in *dhana* etc. as said above.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 13) ननु चार्थवत्समुदायानां नियमार्थत्वे ... etc. A discussion by way of possible objections (*nanu*) against the view expressed in this *Mbh.* and their

refutation (*naiṣa doṣaḥ*) now follows. It is argued that the mention of *samāsa* in P. 1. 2. 46 : कृत्तद्धितसमासाश्च is admitted to be meant for restriction since the name *prātipadika* is already available for a *samāsa* (by P. 1. 2. 45) by reason of its meaningfulness. The restriction is that if there is to be the name *prātipadika* for a whole whose parts are meaningful, it is to be for a *samāsa* only. Such being the case, the objector says that if the constituent phonemes are meaningful then their whole, the *saṁghāta*, itself will be deprived of the name Prātipadika. (It must be said that in the *Dīp.* the use of the word *vākyasya* is rather strange. It has to be interpreted as being a portmanteau term in the sense of a composite, meaningful, linguistic element other than *samāsa*. Or, supply यथा ... तथा. So, यथा वाक्यस्य न प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा तथा वर्णसंघातस्यापि).

The *subutpattivādin* defends his view (*naiṣa doṣaḥ*). The restriction brought in by the opponent is not admissible. It is available where there is already a whole with inflected nominals (*subanta*) as its constituents, while in the present case the meaningful units are only phonemes. Here when the name *prātipadika* becomes due, it becomes due simultaneously for both the whole (*vṛkṣa*) and parts (*v-ṛ-k-ṣ-a*). As the restriction does not operate owing to an absence of *subanta*-s, case endings become due after phonemes.

(*p*. 33, *l*. 15) एकत्वमेषामर्थः. This sentence seems to mean that each phoneme has to convey the singleness of tree (supposing that *vṛkṣaḥ* is our full word). To convey this meaning a case-ending *-su* is necessary after every phoneme.

(*p*. 33, *l*. 15) अथ वाविशेषेणोत्पद्यन्ते etc. An alternative solution. The case-endings come in irrespective of any intention to convey a meaning (like number). The question of restriction (of a particular ending to a particular meaning) comes only thereafter. But once they have come in, the chain of results commences. The sentence अविशेषेणोत्पद्यन्ते, उत्पन्नानां नियमः is taken from the *Mbh.* on P. 2. 4. 82 : उच्यमानेऽप्येतस्मिन् (= सुब्लुकि) स्वाद्युत्पत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति । किं कारणम् ? एकत्वादीनामभावात् । एकत्वादिष्वर्थेषु स्वादयो विधीयन्ते, न चैषामेकत्वादयः सन्ति । अविशेषेणोत्पद्यन्ते, उत्पन्नानां नियमः क्रियते [I. 498. 6–9] । अविशेषेण means संख्यादिरूपम् अर्थविशेषमनपेक्ष्य. नियमः, द्वित्वे एव द्विवचनम्, or बहुत्वे एव बहुवचनम् etc.

(*p*. 33, *l*. 16) ननु च समुदायादुत्पद्यते etc. Another objection against the *subutpatti*. When owing to identical conditions there is a doubt whether the parts should undergo an operation or whether the whole, it is always the whole that undergoes the operation. This is seen in the case of reduplication (*dvirvacana*). In a perfect form like *nineja* from √*nij*, it is the whole root *nij* as an *ekāc* which is reduplicated, in preference to individual *ekāc*-s like *ni*, *i* and *ij*,

(Read the *Mbh.* on P. 6. 1. 1 *Vār.* 2 : एकाचो द्वे भवत इत्युच्यते, तत्र न ज्ञायते कस्यैकाचो द्वे भवत इति। वक्ष्यति 'लिटि धातोरनभ्यासस्य' इति, तेन धातोरेकाच इति विज्ञायते [III. 1. 10-11] and under *Vār.* 7 further on : नेनिजतीत्यत्र निजशब्दोऽप्येकाज्, इज्-शब्दोऽप्येकाज्, इकारोऽप्येकाज्, निशब्दोऽपि। तत्र निज्-शब्दस्य द्विर्वचने रूपं सिद्धं दोषाश्च न सन्ति। [III. 2. 12-14].) Similarly the case-ending will come only after the whole, not after the parts.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 17) सत्यम्, एवमेतत् etc. The *subutpattivādin* admits the opponent's argument, only to turn it against him. If the opponent means that when the whole has undergone the operation, say reduplication, the parts do not undergo it because they are benefitted by the whole's undergoing the operation, well then when the whole (*vṛkṣa*) has got the name *pada*, the parts also are to be supposed to have got that name *pada*. And once they have that name, the operations (like the deleting of *n* in *vana*) demanded by the name *pada* are inevitable.

A perusal of Kaiy. will make clear what Bhar. is saying. Read : नलोपादीनीति। श्रवणं तु विभक्तेर्न भवति, यतो यदैवावयवानां प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा प्रवर्तते तदैव समुदायस्यापि। तत्र तदन्तर्गतत्वाद्विभक्तेर्लुका भवितव्यम्। समासग्रहणेन च तुल्यजातीयस्य सुबन्तावयवसमुदायस्य प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा निवार्यते, न त्वर्थवत्समुदायमात्रस्य। येनैव चार्थेन समुदायस्यार्थवत्त्वं तेनैव चावयवानामपीति विभक्त्युत्पत्तिश्चोद्यते।

[4. 1]

The *Vār.* (13) संघातस्यैकार्थ्यात् ... etc., for which the ground was prepared by the preceding *Mbh.*, refutes the view that there will be case-endings after phonemes if meaningfulness is attributed to them. The ground on which the refutation is based is *aikārthya* of the whole. There is some uncertainty about the exact meaning in which Kāt. has used this word. Its simple interpretation seems to be to take it in the sense of *ekārthasya bhāvaḥ* 'the state of being synonymous with (the parts i. e. phonemes)'. The whole is synonymous with parts; they do not have different meanings. Naturally whatever meaning the case-endings after phonemes are intended to denote will be denoted by the case-ending coming after the whole. The purpose being thus fulfilled by the case-ending after the whole, there will be no case-endings after phonemes (even on the view that they are meaningful).

Pat., however, for reasons of his own, understands *eka* in *aikārthya* in the sense of 'one, single, singular' as is clear from his comment : संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः। तेन वर्णात् सुबुत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति। (He further seems to have taken *eka* in the sense of an abstract noun, meaning 'oneness, singularity'. It appears that Bhar. was not quite sure what Kāt. really meant, and whether Pat. represented

him faithfully, if one is to so guess from the alternative interpretations he quotes.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 20) केचिद् वर्णयन्ति । संघातस्यैकत्वाद् ... etc. The text up to नैकत्वप्रयुक्ताः is not clear. The reason is twofold. Firstly, the whole passage does not seem to *explain* the *Mbh.* (संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः) so much as to *criticize* it. Secondly, the criticism begins with *jāti*-word, but ends with indeclinables. The text may be damaged.

In कार्यकाले (? °लत्वे) संज्ञापरिभाषयोः ... विभक्तिरिति a difficulty is pointed out in the case of *avyaya*-s. The view कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् requires that द्व्येकयोर्द्विवचनैकवचने (P. 1. 4. 22) be combined with ङ्याप्-प्रातिपदिकात् (P. 4. 1. 1) and स्वौजसमौट् ... (P. 4. 1. 2) when case-endings are added. (In the यथोद्देश view such a combination is not necessary.) This makes the addition of the Nom. sing-ending *-su* difficult after *avyaya*-s. They do not have singularity, since they show no distinction made by number. How can then a case-ending be added after them ? The reply is given that the very rule *avyayād āpsupaḥ* (P. 2. 4. 82) which lays dows deletion of feminine suffixes and case-endings presumes that the case-endings do come after *avyaya*-s. Otherwise teaching of their deletion will be meaningless.

[4. 2]

अपरे वर्णयन्ति । वर्णानां ... etc. Here it is maintained that the phonemes convey the object only in a general way, without saying anything about its number. It's only the whole which conveys the number. Therefore this part of meaning belongs to the whole only. It is evidently suggested here that since a case-ending has no job to do (such as denoting the number), it will not appear after the individual phonemes.

Observations : (1) It is not known why a case-ending after the whole only should be able to declare the number and not the one after a phoneme. The differentiating reasons are not given.

(2) When the *Dīp.* says संख्याधिगमः समुदायादेव, it is not clear whether the final case-ending is meant to be included in the whole or not. If yes, the function of denoting the number can be assigned to the case-ending. If, on the other hand, only the nominal stem is meant by *samudāya*, then technically the number will have to be regarded as expressed (*vācana*) by the stem while the case-ending will have only a subordinate position, namely to help the stem (*dyotana*) in bringing out the number. Cf. Nāg. here (on *Mbh.* संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः) केचित्तु विभक्तिः प्रकृत्यर्थगतप्रकृतिबोध्यसंख्याद्योतिका । संख्या च समुदायस्यैवार्थो, न प्रत्येकवर्णानामिति न तेभ्यः स्वाद्युत्पत्तिः । एकत्वं संघातस्यार्थः इति भाष्यस्वरसात् । प्रकृत्यंशे वर्णव्यत्ययापाययोः संख्यान्तरानुपजननात् सा समुदायस्यैवार्थ इति तद्भावः ।

This alternative view is not mentioned in Kaiy. Did Nāg. get it directly from Bhar. ?

(3) समुदायस्यैकत्वमर्थः is evidently a paraphrase of the *Mbh.* संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः।

[4. 3]

अन्ये वर्णयन्ति। एकमेतदेकत्वम् ... etc. Another explanation advanced by some. The case-ending (-*su*) after phonemes denotes singularity. The same case-ending after the whole also denotes singularity. And these two singularities are not two different things. They are one and the same. So one case-ending, i. e. the one after the whole, will do. If it had been unable to denote the singularity of meaning of phonemes, there was some sense in case endings coming after phonemes. As it is, the case-ending after the whole is quite capable of it. So there is no possibility of case-endings after phonemes even on the view that they are meaningful. — न (in नैकेनैव, line 3) is syntactically connected with the verb *upādatte*.

Observations : (1) After यतस्तु समर्था (*p.* 34, *l.* 3) some words like वर्णेभ्यो न सुबुत्पत्तिः seem to have been somehow lost in the MS.

(2) This is the only interpretation given by Kaiy. Also the parallel यथानेको द्रष्टा नैकेनैव ... etc. recurs in his comm. Read : अत्र परिहारमाह — संघातस्येति। वृक्ष इत्यत्रैकत्वं विभक्त्या द्योत्यते। तच्चैकमित्येकैव विभक्तिरुत्पद्यते। यथा बहवो द्रष्टार एकेनैव प्रदीपेन दृश्यमर्थं पश्यन्ति। सा चोत्पद्यमाना समुदायादेव तन्त्रेण सर्वानुग्राहिण्युत्पद्यते, समुदायद्विर्वचनवत्। पदसंज्ञा तु समुदायस्यैव भवति, न प्रत्येकम्, असुबन्तत्वात्, 'यस्मात् प्रत्ययविधिः' इत्यनुवर्तनात्।

[4. 4]

इहभवन्तस्त्वाहुः - 'संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः' etc. The last interpretation. The *ihabhavat* (Bhartṛhari's Guru ?) in his interpretation seems to lay emphasis on the 'word' *saṁghāta*. *Saṁghāta* literally means hammering into one, a unity brought about by hammering. So the *Mbh.* संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः according to the *ihabhavat* means 'the word *saṁghāta* means unity.' The unity of meaning which characterises the whole characterises the phonemes also. (An अर्थेन is to be supplied after येनैवैकत्ववता and is similarly understood after तेनैव in the same line later). The parallel of *samudāyadvirvacana* is also referred to when it is said — in order to bring out the unity — by way of parallel that even when the constituent monosyllabic unities (e. g. *ni*, *i* and *ij*) are there, the whole *nij* is also called an *ekāc*, and vice versa. And if it is insisted that the constituents (i. e. the phonemes) etc. require a case-ending, then one can infer that the one after the whole can extend itself and embrace the phonemes. — What the author

means by *anumānāt* (by inference) is not clear but it is probable that he means समुदायद्विर्वचनन्यायेन.

(*p*. 34, *l*. 7) न च पदसंज्ञावयवानाम् etc. This is meant to allay an apprehension. If the case-ending after the whole covers phonemes also, will there not be the the designation *pada* for the phonemes also, and consequently the loss of *n* in *dhana* etc. ? No, says the *Dīp*. The meaningfulness and the consequential designation *prātipadika* and the resulting case-ending are all merely inferential; the designation *pada*, on the other hand, is taught directly by a rule. (P. 1. 4. 14 : सुप्तिङन्तं पदम्)

(*p*. 34, *l*. 9) यथैवाङ्गसंज्ञा या शब्दवतीति ... etc. I have emended MS अङ्गसंज्ञायां शब्दवति (retained in the eds.) to अङ्गसंज्ञा या शब्दव[ती]ति which gives a good sense as against the MS reading. इति 'therefore' joins this with the following sentence. Because पदसंज्ञा is शब्दवती, therefore काकदन्तपरीक्षणमिदं. 'किं वर्णाः. ...' etc. Since there is no possibility of the designation Pada, there is no possibility of *nalopa*. So what does it matter whether phonemes are meaningful or not ? The whole discussion is futile.

काकदन्तपरीक्षणमिदम्. This outburst of the conviction that this enquiry into the meaningfulness or otherwise of phonemes is quite useless is uncalled for and out of place here. The arguments in favour of their meaningfulness have been heard. The objection against it is also just answered. The arguments in favour of the opposite view, viz. meaninglessness of phonemes are yet to come. Such being the case, to declare, in the midst of hearing, that the whole enquiry is useless is, to say the least, very strange. The enquiry is as useful and as theoretically justified as any other in this field and it is surprising that such a cynical view should have been expressed. Also, we do not know whose opinion this is, whether Bhartṛhari's own or of the *ihabhavat* whose view on the संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः has been quoted just above in the *Dīp*.

Incidentally, counting of a crow's teeth is one of the three occupations which are regarded as idle, and serving no useful purpose, mentioned in the following stanza :

काकस्य कति वा दन्ता मेषस्याण्डं कियत्पलम् ।
रासभे कति रोमाणि मूर्खस्यैषा विचारणा ॥

Observation : As remarked above (4. 1 beginning) Pat. seems to have ignored the simple meaning of the *Vār*. and given a twist to it. While we do not know why he did so, one thing seems to be sure, viz. that the scope of Kāt's argument is considerably restricted. Firstly a case-ending serves to denote mainly the Kāraka relation and number. In Pat's interpretation there is no place for

Kāraka at all. Secondly, the singular is just one of the three numbers. All the three are involved in the present discussion. Pat.'s interpretation, however, centres round the singular only. Thirdly, supposing that Pat.'s treatment of the singular is only for the sake of illustration (*upalakṣaṇārtham*), still how is this *ekatva* to be reconciled with the duality and the plurality in the dual (*vṛkṣau*) and the plural (*vṛkṣāḥ*) respectively ? Perhaps it will be suggested that the *Mbh.* could be interpreted in such a context to mean that there is *ekatva* between the meaning (duality) denoted by the case-ending after the whole and by the one after a phoneme. And the same applies to the plural also. But then this agrees better with the simple meaning of *aikārthya* = 'synonymous' suggested above, and amounts to refuting the original statement of the *Mbh.*, viz. संघातस्यैकत्वमर्थः.

Bhar. gives four different interpretations (4. 1–4) given by different people but none of them raises the point which I have raised. Also even the later major commentators, Kaiy. and Nāg. do not seem to have thought of it.

[5. 1]

This *Vār.* (14) अनर्थकास्तु प्रतिवर्णमर्थानुपलब्धेः and the next plead for the meaninglessness of phonemes.

अपि (in अनुमानादपि) refers to *pratyakṣa.* In the case of isolated phonemes, meaning is neither understood directly nor can it be established on the basis of inference. Hence *Dīp.*'s conclusion : प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामनर्थका वर्णा इति। Nāg. holds a different opinion. Commenting on this *Vār.* he says : अनुमानेन साधितामर्थवत्तां प्रत्यक्षविरोधेन दूषयति. Raghunathashastri, the Editor of the Nirnayasāgar ed. (1932) in his footnote (3), however, modifies his statement thus : प्रत्यक्षमूलकानुमानविरोधेनेत्यर्थः ।

The *Vār.* 9 established the meaningfulness of phonemes by citing single phonemes which are roots, suffixes etc. The present *Vār.* refutes that reasoning by showing that the reason (*hetu*) is inconclusive. There are certain phonemes which have no meaning, e. g. phoneme *v* (in *vṛkṣa*). If the syllogism proving the meaningfulness of phonemes can be formulated as :

वर्णाः अर्थवन्तः । (एकत्वे सति) वर्णत्वात् । एकवर्णात्मकधात्वादिवत्,

a rival syllogism, indicating the *anaikāntikatva* of the *hetu*, can be formulated like this :

वर्णाः अनर्थकाः । वर्णत्वात् । वृक्षादिगतवकारादिवत् ।

Here वर्णाः of course mean phonemes other than those constituting roots, suffixes etc. Cf. Kaiy. : धात्वादिव्यतिरिक्ता वर्णाः पक्षीक्रियन्ते । अन्यथा शास्त्रविरोधः प्राप्नोति । Bhar. does not think it necessary to mention this point.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 12) न हि क्ष इति etc. In words like *vṛkṣa* and *ṛkṣa,* the element -*kṣa* is common (*anvayin*), but no common meaning is seen. Elsewhere, where elements are common, common meaning is there as e. g. in *bhavati bhavataḥ bhavanti* there is a common word-element ($\sqrt{bh\bar{u}}$) and also correspondingly the meaning ('to be').

What the eds. read as विपी and insert a ट in between under the mistaken notion that a synonym of *vṛkṣa* is intended, I read as न्वयी, coming from [ऽ]-न्वयी. This fits in well with सत्ता अन्वयिनी in the following clause. I also supply one भवति in the illustration to complete the paradigm. In the MS one additional स (before सत्ता°) and अन्वयिनां (instead of °नी) seem to be scribal errors.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 13) तस्मात् दशदाडिमश्लोकवत्. Actually this example of an isolated phrase not conveying a self-contained meaning occurs in the *Mbh.* on P. 1. 1. 1, *Vār.* 2. Read : लोके ह्यर्थवन्ति चानर्थवन्ति च वाक्यानि दृश्यन्ते। अर्थवन्ति तावत् 'देवदत्त, गामभ्याज शुक्लां दण्डेन' ...। अनर्थकानि — दश दाडिमानि, षडपूपाः कुण्डमजाजिनं etc. The word *śloka* may have crept in the *Dīp.* erroneously.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 14) प्रतिवर्णमिति। The *Mbh.* runs thus : किमिदं प्रतिवर्णमिति? वर्णं वर्णं प्रतिवर्णम्। A question is raised in the *Mbh.* about the status and the meaning of the expression प्रतिवर्णम् in the *Vār.* (Incidentally, वाक्ये = वार्त्तिके). The questioner suggests that in the *Vār.* प्रति and वर्णम् may be two different words, in which case प्रति would be a *karmapravacanīya* in the sense of *lakṣaṇa* (P. 1. 4. 90). So this possibility is also there. Which one is intended by Kāt.?

The repetition वर्णं वर्णं (in the *Mbh.* reply वर्णं वर्णं प्रति प्रतिवर्णम्) indicates, as explained by the *Dīp.*, that प्रतिवर्णम् is a compound of प्रति with वर्णं in the sense of *vīpsā* 'pervasion' — thus प्रतिवर्णम् means 'in every phoneme'. The compound has been formed by P. 2. 1. 6 : अव्ययं विभक्तिसमीप ... यथानुपूर्व्य ... etc. One of the meanings of यथा is वीप्सा, cf. the *Kāś.* : योग्यता, वीप्सा, पदार्थानतिवृत्तिः, सादृश्यं चेति यथार्थाः. The repetition (वर्णं वर्णम्) does not find a place in the compound (प्रतिवर्णम्) because the semantic aspect of pervasion is conveyed by the compound itself.

वीप्सा च समासे ... सप्तवर्णः, अष्टापदम् इति यथा. This is taken from the *Mbh.* on P. 2. 3. 1 *Vār.* 1. Read : अनभिहितवचनमनर्थकम्। किं कारणम्? अन्यत्रापि विहितस्याभावादभिहिते। अन्यत्राप्यभिहिते विहितं न भवति। क्वान्यत्र? चित्रगुः, शबलगुः। बहुव्रीहिणोक्तत्वान् मत्वर्थस्य, मत्वर्थीयो न भवति। ... सप्तपर्णोऽष्टापद इति। समासेनोक्तत्वाद् वीप्सायाः, द्विर्वचनं न भवति। [I. 439. 5-9]

The tree is called *saptaparṇa,* not because it has seven leaves, but because it has leaves in bunches of seven (सप्त सप्त पर्णान्यस्य). The *vīpsā* (pervasion, distribution) is expressed in the sentence by repetition (P. 8. 1. 4;

नित्यवीप्सयोः, under the Adhikāra सर्वस्य द्वे [P. 8. 1. 1]). In the compound it is expressed by the compound itself, hence no repetition of सप्त there.

It has to be noted that in the further course of this discussion the *Mbh.* refutes this argument, arguing that *saptaparṇa* (also *aṣṭāpada*) is no example of समासेनोक्तत्वाद्वीप्सायाः, द्विर्वचनं न भवति, since the very word with which *vīpsā* is connected, viz. *parvan* or *kāṇḍa* 'joint' is not used here. Read : यदप्युच्यते — सप्तपर्णोऽष्टापद इति समासेनोक्तत्वाद्वीप्सायाः, द्विर्वचनं न भवतीति। यदत्र वीप्सायुक्तं नादः प्रयुज्यते। किं पुनस्तत्? पर्वणि पर्वणि सप्त पर्णान्यस्य। पङ्क्तौ पङ्क्तावष्टौ पदान्यस्य [I. 439. 14–16].

Similarly, in the earlier view *aṣṭapada* 'having eight squares (?)' (a board for a game) is first interpreted as अष्टौ अष्टौ पदान्यस्य, but in the subsequent view as पङ्क्तौ पङ्क्तौ अष्टौ पदान्यस्य.

[5. 2]

The *Vār.* (15) वर्णव्यत्ययापायो ... etc. is the second *Vār.* giving another reason in favour of the meaninglessness of phonemes. It is also the last *Vār.* on this topic. This *Vār.* shows the inconclusiveness of the reason in *Vār*-s 10, 11. It is now maintained that there may be addition, omission or interchange of phonemes and yet there is no corresponding addition, omission, or interchange of meaning. — There is an apparent contradiction of terms in वर्णाः अनर्थकाः ... अर्थदर्शनात् (cf. Nāg. ननु वर्णव्यत्ययादिष्वर्थदर्शनं नार्थवत्त्वाभावसाधकम् ...). So Bhar. says : नायमानर्थक्यप्रसाधको हेतुः। किं तर्हि? परेणोक्तस्य व्यभिचारहेतुः। The *Mbh.* illustrates the *Vār.* thus :

वर्णव्यत्यये — कृतेस्तर्कुः, कसेः सिकताः, हिंसेः सिंहः। वर्णव्यत्ययो नार्थव्यत्ययः। अपायो लोपः। हतः, घ्नन्ति, घ्नन्तु, अघ्नन्। वर्णापायो नार्थापायः। उपजन आगमः। लविता, लवितुम्। वर्णोपजनो नार्थोपजनः। विकार आदेशः। घातयति, घातकः। वर्णविकारो नार्थविकारः।

(*p.* 34, *l.* 19) कालव्यत्यासेन प्रयोगः. In actual utterance metathesis implies only inversion of sequence in time. In the present example (which is to come) *ādi* comes first, *anta* later in time. In the form with metathesis (*antādī*), the temporal sequence is reversed (कालव्यत्यासेन).

(*p.* 34, *l.* 22) यथैव 'आद्यन्तौ' 'अन्तादी' ... etc. A counter-example where there is interchange of meanings, where the elements are known to be meaningful. In *tarku* 'spindle' from *kṛt* 'to weave', no such corresponding interchange of meaning.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 23) अथ मन्यसे — एक एवार्थः ... etc. A reply from the advocate of the meaningfulness of phonemes is here anticipated. He will perhaps say that there is just *one* meaning for the whole, e. g. *tarku* (< *kart* + *u*). So even when there is an interchange of places between *t* and *k* there cannot be

a corresponding *vyatyaya* of meaning. So this cannot be adduced as refuting his argument : *varṇavyatyaye cārthāntaragamanāt* (*Vār*. 10), for the application of which other examples (*kūpa* : *sūpa* etc.) have been already given.

(*p*. 34, *l*. 23) एवमपि व्यत्ययस्य वैचित्र्यम् etc. Granting the above reply, the advocate of meaninglessness of phonemes continues. There is no correspondence between *varṇavyatyaya* and *arthavyatyaya*. The latter takes a variety of forms, which cannot reasonably be assigned to *varṇavyatyaya*. — Although the MS clearly reads तंत्वादिषु (retained by the eds.), I have emended it to तर्क्वादिषु, firstly because in तन्तु there is no वर्णव्यत्यय, and secondly, because the *Mbh*. illustrates वर्णव्यत्यये अर्थदर्शनम् by कृतेस्तर्कुः .

(*p*. 34, *l*. 25) अपायो यथैव वकारस्य etc. An example where there is a change of meaning (अर्थान्तरगतिः) corresponding to the loss of phoneme was given by the opponent viz. *vṛkṣa* 'tree' : *ṛkṣa* (after the deletion of *v*) 'bear, or star'. But a counter-example can be shown where there is deletion of a phoneme, but no loss of meaning, viz. *ghnanti* (< *han*; here the radical *a* is dropped by P. 6. 4. 98 : गमहनजन etc.). The root *ghn* (< *hn* < *han*) continues to have its meaning.

(*p*. 34, *l*. 27) लविता, लवितुम् etc. One more argument for the meaninglessness of phonemes. In the case of meaningful units, their addition (उपजन) causes addition of meaning. Thus : *datta* 'given', but *yajñadatta* 'given by sacrifice'. *Datta* is the example of a unit which has a lexical meaning. In शब्दश्चानुमानिक्या°... etc., the *Dīp*. gives the example of an element having a grammatical meaning (which is inferential — आनुमानिक). — A verb like कुर्यात् and some words expressing an alternative seem to have been lost in the MS.

In *aupagava* (*upagu* + *a*) 'a descendant of Upagu', the suffix *a*(*ṇ*) adds the meaning 'descendant of'. No such addition of meaning is brought about by *i* (the *iḍāgama*) in the meaning of *-tum* in *lavitum* etc.

(*p*. 35, *l*. 1) विकारः सूपादिभिः समानः ... etc. The substitution of one phoneme in the place of another (as of *s* in the place of *k* of *kūpa*) was pointed out (2. 2) as showing the meaningfulness of phonemes. But counter-examples like *ghātayati* (where *han-* > *ghāt-*) can be shown where substitution of a phoneme has not resulted in the substitution of a new meaning — for *ghāt-* in the place of old *han*. The three phonemes of *han-* thus undergo replacement : *h* > *gh* P. 7. 3. 54 : हो हन्तेर्ञ्णिन्नेषु, *a* > *ā* P. 7. 2. 116 : अत उपधायाः and, finally *n* > *t* P. 7. 3. 32 : हनस्तोऽचिण्णलोः. — In the *Dīp*. (line 1) अत्रापि refers to घातयति, घातकः of the *Mbh*.

[6]

उभयमिदं वर्णेषूक्तम् etc. This introduces the concluding part of the *Mbh.* on this topic where its own decision in the matter is given. The *Mbh.* runs thus : उभयमिदं वर्णेषूक्तम् । अर्थवन्तोऽनर्थका इति । किमत्र न्याय्यम् ?

(*p.* 35, *l.* 3) एतत् पृच्छति, किं धात्वादीनाम् ... etc. The expression एतत् पृच्छति in the *Dīp.* refers to the *Mbh.* question किमत्र न्याय्यम्, not quoted in the *Dīp.* This question (किमत्र न्याय्यम् — 'what is here the right or reasonable view ?') apparently looks simple. One would be led to think that it can be simply paraphrased by किं वर्णा अर्थवन्त आहोस्विदनर्थकाः ? But Bhar. puts the question in a rather subtler form : Are we to conclude that all phonemes are meaningful (as in the case of those which constitute roots etc.), and that where meaning is not perceived, that is due to some extraneous reason ? Or are we to conclude that all phonemes are meaningless, and that the apparent meaningfulness of phonemes in some cases (as in those which constitute roots etc.) is an illusion, like a fire-brand wheel ? The former alternative means that phonemes are ordinarily meaningful as phonemes, the latter that they are not meaningful as phonemes, the source of their meaningfulness where it is perceived being to be looked for elsewhere. — For the addition of [मर्थवत्त्वा], see *Readings.*

(*p.* 35, *l.* 6) उभयमित्याह. Pat. refuses to philosophise. His stand is empirical. We accept the meaningfulness of phonemes where it is seen, we don't accept it where it is not seen, that's all. This is explained by the *Dīp.* with यस्य व्यावहारिकी अर्थवत्ता शक्यानुमानात्, तत्र कल्पयितव्या (i. e. यत्र अनुमानात् अर्थवत्ता कल्पयितुं शक्या, तत्र सा कल्पयितव्या ।). The अनुमान of course depends on अन्वय-व्यतिरेक. (Cf. Kaiy. : यत्रान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामर्थवत्ता शक्यते कल्पयितुं तत्रैवासावभ्युपगन्तव्या, न सर्वत्रेत्यर्थः.) So the meaninglessness and meaningfulness of phonemes have their different regions (भिन्नविषये; similarly Nāg. उभयस्य न्याय्यत्वं भेदेन ...).

(*p.* 35, *l.* 8) समानमीहमानानाम् इति etc. This *Mbh.* illustrates its statement that the meaningfulness of some phonemes and its absence in others is there by nature (स्वभावतः). Why A has a particular power while B does not have it is not to be questioned. It is to be accepted as it is. The *Mbh.* reads : तद्यथा समानमीहमानानामधीयानानां च केचिदर्थैर्युज्यन्ते, अपरे न । न चेदानीं कश्चिदर्थवानिति कृत्वा सर्वैरर्थवद्भिः शक्यं भवितुम्, कश्चिद्वानर्थक इति कृत्वा सर्वैरनर्थकैः । तत्र किमस्माभिः शक्यं कर्तुम् ? — यद् धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययनिपाता एकवर्णा अर्थवन्तोऽन्येऽनर्थका इति । स्वाभाविकमेतत् ।

(*p.* 35, *l.* 9) संघातान्तराण्येवैतानि. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : संघातान्तराण्येवैतान्येवंजातीयकान्यर्थान्तरेषु वर्तन्ते, कूपः सूपो यूप इति । यदि हि वर्णव्यत्ययकृतमर्थान्तरगमनं स्यात्, भूयिष्ठः कूपार्थः सूपे स्यात् सूपार्थश्च कूपे । ... यतस्तु खलु न कश्चित् कूपस्य वा सूपे सूपस्य वा यूपे ... अतो मन्यामहे — संघातान्तराण्येवैतान्येवंजातीयकान्यर्थान्तरेषु वर्तन्त इति ।

It was earlier pointed out (by the opponent) that by substitution (of phoneme (as of *s* in the place of *k* in *kūpa*) or by dropping one (as *v* from *vṛkṣa*) we get a different meaning. (So the phonemes were meaningful.) It is now made clear in the *Mbh.* that the meaning resides in the *saṁghāta* as a whole. (संघातान्तराण्येव ... अर्थान्तरेषु वर्तन्ते). If a change of meaning is seen to follow a change of phoneme, it is because a change in phoneme is a change in the *saṁghāta*, the whole. Because the whole changes (with the slightest change in phoneme), so the meaning changes.

यत्र ह्यानुमानिक्यर्थवत्ता ... etc. This *Dīp.* explains the *Mbh.* भूयिष्ठः कूपार्थः सूपे स्यात् etc. Since three phonemes (out of four !) are common to *kūpa*, *yūpa* and *sūpa* one would expect a major part (*bhūyiṣṭhaḥ*, if not exactly three fourths) of the meaning to be common to all the three. This is, for instance, the case where we assign meanings to linguistic units on the basis of correct *anvaya-vyatireka*. For instance, in the three cognate words *pakti*, *pacana* and *pāka* (all meaning the act of cooking) the word-part *pac* is common (*anvayin*) to all the three and so also the continuation (*anugama*; for this emendation, see *Notes*) of a major part of meaning. The only difference in the meanings of the three finished words is that of gender, made by the different suffix. Since no common meaning can be assigned to *ūpa* in the three words, one cannot regard that *ūpa* has remained constant and that only the initial phonemes have changed (न ... ऊपशब्दे व्यवस्थिते वर्णव्यत्ययः): one has to regard that in the apparent change of *one* phoneme the *whole saṁghāta* has changed everytime.

(*p.* 35, *l.* 13) इदं खल्वपि भवता. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.*: इदं खल्वपि भवता वर्णानामर्थवत्तां ब्रुवता साधीयोऽनर्थकत्वं द्योतितम्। यो हि मन्यते यः कूपे कूपार्थः स ककारस्य ... ऊपशब्दस्तस्यानर्थकः स्यात्।

The *Dīp.* समुदायान्तरत्वे नाभ्युपगम्यमाने ... भ्युपगमात् seems to say that if one does not accept these (*kūpa*, *sūpa* etc.) as different independent wholes, the number of meaningless phonemes in the Sanskrt language will increase greatly. There will be a large number of sound-complexes like *ūpa*, which outwardly appear to be constant, yet do not convey a meaning and so will have to be regarded as meaningless. On the other hand, if the meaningfulness is assigned to the whole, then the phonemes serve their purpose by building the whole which then conveys the meanings. As modern linguists also say, the only purpose of a phoneme is 'to keep two utterances apart'.

(*p.* 35, *l.* 16) संघातार्थवत्त्वात् इति। अस्य परिहारं वक्ष्यति. Here the *Mbh.* says that the *Vār.* 12 : संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्च remains unrefuted (तत्रेदमपरिहृतम् 'संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्च' इति। It will be refuted by Kāt. in his *Vār.*: संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्चेति चेद् दृष्टो ह्यतदर्थेन गुणेन गुणिनोऽर्थभावः on P. 1. 2. 45 : अर्थवदधातुः ... etc. The *Vār.* is quoted

slightly differently as इष्टा ... अर्थवत्ता instead of इष्टो ... अर्थभावः as occurs in the *Mbh.* (ed.). Besides, रथाङ्गवत् is the illustration supplied by Pat. It is not a part of the *Vār*. The *Vār.* purports to say that a whole does not necessarily owe its properties to parts. It can have properties which are not there in the parts. The intoxicating capacity of liquor does not belong to the parts (सुराङ्गवत्). Similarly the parts of a chariot individually are not useful to take you to different places, but their whole, the chariot, is. So the argument संघातार्थत्वाच्च is not strong enough to grant meaningfulness to phonemes which properly belongs to the whole.

Observation: During this discussion one becomes acutely conscious of one desideratum of the ancient Sanskrit grammar: there the concept of 'morpheme' of modern linguistics is lacking. (So the *Mbh.* has everytime to enumerate the meaningful elements in the Sanskrit grammar — *dhātu*, *prātipadika* etc.) If such a concept had been there, the grammarians could say that meaning belongs to morphems. They may consist of one or more phonemes. But even when a morpheme consists of a single phoneme, the meaning belongs to the phoneme not as a phoneme but because of its status as a morpheme. The only function of phonemes is to build these higher units, the morphemes. In the case of the *saṁghāta* the *Chāyā* thus observes: समुदायस्थानां तत्संपादनेन कृतार्थानां 'फलवत्संनिधौ ...' इति न्यायेन न पृथगर्थत्वकल्पनमिति भावः। the *saṁghāta* thus comes very near to the concept of morpheme.

Readings: (1) (*p.* 31, *l.* 8) MSAL अनुपलभ्यमानाद्; Sw अनुमानाद् (for the emendation अनुपलभ्यमा[नमनुमा]नाद्. — (2) (*p.* 31, *l.* 11) MS त्वे×मनु°; AL चेदमनु°; Sw त्वनु° (for त्वेवम्). — (3) (*p.* 31, *ll.* 11-12) MSSw क्रियते। क्रियस्यपि (Sw °य्यि); AL. °ते। उपरतक्रि° (for क्रियते, ऽक्रियस्यापि). — (4) (*p.* 31, *l.* 13) MS Sw यद्येष; AL यद्येषा (for यदेषा). — (5) MS रूपस्थोप°. — (6) (*p.* 31, *ll.* 13-14) MS चरूस्य; Sw च रू(प)स्य. — (7) (*p.* 31, *l.* 15) MSSw विष(Sw °षं)-शिष्टदेवश(Sw [°स्प]र्श)स्यैव (for विशिष्टदेशस्थैव as in AL). — (8) (*p.* 31, *l.* 16) MS सर्वांसवानु°; Sw सर्वेत्रानु° (for सर्वत्रैवानु° as in AL). — (9) (*p.* 31, *l.* 16) AL do not put any punctuation mark between धात्वादीनां and वर्णानां. (This could mean: धात्वादीनां ये वर्णास्तेषाम्.) — (10) (*p.* 31, *l.* 17) After वर्णानामपि, MSAL read सा चानुमानिकी°. — (11) (*p.* 31, *l.* 18) MS अर्थवछतो; Sw °वत: (for °वच्छब्दे as in AL). — (12) (*p.* 31, *l.* 19) MS त्वा; AL स्यात् (for त्वानुमानिकी as in Sw). — (13) AL स्वराङ्गवत्. — (14) (*p.* 31, *l.* 20) AL अर्थावयवाः. — (15) (*p.* 31, *l.* 22) MS यथद्वं; AL यथा शब्दे (for यथा पदानि). — (16) MS सपक्षाणि. — (17) (*p.* 31, *l.* 26) MSSw एकवर्णत्वं. — (18) (*p.* 32, *l.* 1) MSSw स अयं तावत्वेतधर्मो; AL साऽर्थवत्ता चेतनधर्मः. See Notes. — (19) (*p.* 32, *ll.* 1-2) AL इह योऽर्थात्मकेन चिद्धर्मेणायोग्यः. See Notes. — (20) (*p.* 32, *l.* 3) MS तिपद्य°; ALSw प्रतिपद्यै°. — (21) MSSw यो (for योग्यो as in AL). — (22) (*p.* 33, *l.* 4) MSALSw केवलस्यैव

(AL °वं) सा°. — (22) (*p*. 32, *l*. 10) MS उपदेशशब्दे (for ऊप°). — (23) (*p*. 32, *l*. 12) MSAL तस्या(MS °स्य)पि (for तथापि). — (24) (*p*. 32, *l*. 15) MS [ऽ]नुगम्यते. — (25) AL ins. तु before विरत्र. MSALSw कुसा(Sw °ला)वकमापिबतां (for पृथग्भावकर्मा विपिबति). See Notes. — (26) (*p*. 32, *l*. 16) AL सोमं (for सोऽयं). — (27) MS °शष्टानु°; ALSw °शिष्टानु° (for °शब्दानु°). — (28) (*p*. 32, *l*. 21) MS Sw °गमादिहत्ययावतिवमात्रमेवेति; AL °गमादिह या च यावती च मात्रैवेति (for °गमाविह त्वपायमात्रमेवेति). See Notes. — (29) (*p*. 32, *l*. 23) MS ALSw न (for the emendation तु). See Notes. — (30) (*p*. 32, *l*. 24) MSSw किंचिद् (for कंचिद्). — (31) (*p*. 32, *l*. 26) MSALSw प्रक्रान्तस्य (°न्तस्य तस्य). — (32) (*p*. 32, *l*. 27) MSAL प्रयुक्तम् (for अयुक्तम् as in Sw). — (33) (*p*. 33, *l*. 2) Sw उष्ट्रमुखमिति. — (34) AL इव (for एव). — (35) Sw निर्वर्तते. — (36) (*p*. 33, *l*. 3) MS नान्यत अश्वावयवे; Sw नान्ययत् अश्वाव° (for नान्यत्र अव°). — After मुखशब्दो the MS reads : न च हेतुर्यदाथा तिलेस्ति काचित् तैलमात्र एवं वर्णेष्वपि. — (37) Sw drops (the second) स च समुदायशब्दो. — (38) (*p*. 33, *l*. 4) AL इव (for एव). — (39) MSSw प्रकृत्यर्थे. — (40) (*p*. 33, *l*. 10) MSSw शास्त्रेषु. — (41) (*p*. 33, *l*. 12) MS स्वादयति; AL स्वादेरिति; Sw चोदयति (for स्वादेश्चोदयति). — (42) (*p*. 33, *l*. 13) AL नियमार्थत्वात् न; Sw °र्थं(त्वा)त्तेन (for °र्थत्वे न). — (43) AL °स्याप्यर्थवत्ता. — (44) (*p*. 33, *l*. 17) MS पृथदत्वेनार्थिनः; AL पृथक्त्वे नार्थिनः (for पृथक् पदत्वेना° as in Sw). — (45) (*p*. 33, *l*. 19) MS नदि; Sw न यदि इदम् (for तर्हि as in AL). — (46) (*p*. 33, *l*. 21) MSAL दर्शयन्ति (for वर्ण°). — (47) (*p*. 33, *ll*. 21–22) AL कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम्, ङ्याप्प्राति°. — (48) (*p*. 34. *l*. 3) MSSw अभिव्यक्तम् (for °व्यङ्क्तुम्). — (49) (*p*. 34, *l*. 3) Sw सुसमर्था. — (50) MSALSw यथा चैको. (50A) (*p*. 34, *l*. 6) ALSw येन चैकत्व°. — (51) (*p*. 34, *l*. 7) MSSw वाक्यवान्. — (52) MS सप्रष्टुं; Sw संस्प्रष्टुं. — (53) (*p*. 34, *l*. 8) MS शब्दत्वात् शदं चद्विधानं; ALSw शाब्दत्वात्। शाब्दं च वि(Sw चेद्वि)धानं. — (54) (*p*. 34, *l*. 9) MSAL Sw अङ्गसंज्ञाया° शब्दवति. See Notes. — (55) (*p*. 34, *l*. 12) AL अथैषाम् (for अप्ये°). — (56) (*p*. 34, *ll*. 12–13) MS AL Sw विटपी (for ऽन्वयी) and [अ]न्वयिनाम् (for [अ]न्वयिनी), for both of which see Notes. — (57) (*p*. 34, *l*. 17) *Mbh*. ed. °रेष्वर्थदर्शनात्. — (58) (*p*. 34, *l*. 18) MS आनर्थक्यप्रसावको; Sw °क्यस्य साधको. — (59) (*p*. 34, *l*, 20) MS भवितादि ।; AL °तादिः ।; । Sw °तादि(षु) । (for भवत्यादि-). — (60) (*p*. 34, *l*, 23) Sw °समाप्तिरिति. — (61) (*p*. 34, *l*. 24) MS ALSw तन्त्वादिषु (for तक्वा°). — (62) (*p*. 34, *l*. 25) Sw अपाये (for the first अपायो). — (63) MSSw पापो (for the second [अ]पायो). — (64) (*p*. 34, *l*. 26) MSSw इकारस्य (for अका°). — (65) MS तदार्थांतर-; AL अर्थान्तर-; Sw तदर्था°.— It has been necessary to supply न twice here, (1) after अकारस्य, and (2) after अनुमानं. — (66) (*p*. 34, *l*. 27) MS भविता भवितुमिति (for लवि°). — (67) MS पदस्य उउपजाने; AL °स्योपजनः ।; Sw °स्य तु उपजने. — (68) (*p*. 34, *l*. 28) MS °मानिक्यर्थं°. — (69) (*p*. 35, *ll*. 3–4) MS धात्वादीनां × दं; ALSw °दीनामिदं. I rather think that the damaged letter is द्वि. For this reason, and in view of the argument being made here, I supply [मर्थवत्त्वा] between धात्वादीना (the last letter

corrected from नां) and दिदं. — (70) (*p.* 35, *l.* 10) MSSw [ऽ]र्थांतरो यो; AL ऽर्थान्तरोपायो (for our emended °र्थानुगमो which suits the intended meaning best). — (71) (*p.* 35, *l.* 11) MS व्यभिचारेके; AL °चारे; Sw °चारे के. — (72) (*p.* 35, *l.* 12) Sw ऊपशब्दानुगमेन (directly contradictory to the intended meaning). — (73) (*p.* 35, *l.* 13) MSALSw यूपशब्दे (for the emendation ऊप°). It is, however, probable that the MS reading, which looks like °पत्तव्यंयूप°, is really °पत्तव्यमूप°. In that case our text is not an emendation, but a better interpretation of the MS itself. — (74) (*p.* 35, *l.* 14) Sw (unnecessarily) ऽनभ्युपगम्यमाने. — (75) (*p.* 35, *l.* 16) *Mbh.* ed. एतस्यापि [प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञायां)] (for अस्य). — (76) (*p.* 35, *l.* 17) The text of P. 1. 2. 45 *Vār.* 11 in the *Mbh.* ed. : संघातार्थवत्त्वाच्चेति चेद् दृष्टो ह्यतदर्थेन गुणेन गुणिनोऽर्थभावः.

[V]

[1]

The topic of discussion in this section is how code-letters which are read after every Śiva-sūtra, though physically present there, are ultimately excluded from the operation of abbreviations like *ac*. The discussion is originally contained in these three Ślokavārttikas :

प्रत्याहारेऽनुबन्धानां कथमज्ग्रहणेषु न।
आचारादप्रधानत्वाल्लोपश्च बलवत्तरः॥
ऊकालोऽजिति वा योगस्तत्कालानां यथा भवेत्।
अचां ग्रहणमच्कार्यं तेनैषां न भविष्यति॥
ह्रस्वादीनां वचनात् प्राग् यावत् तावदेव योगोऽस्तु।
अच्कार्याणि यथा स्युस्तत्कालेष्वक्षु कार्याणि॥

एतेऽपि ह्यत्र संनिविष्टा ... etc. Perhaps it may be said that the main place of code-letters *ṇ*, *k* etc. is among the consonants : of *ṇ* in ञमङणनम् (Sū. 7), of *k* in कपय् (Sū. 12). So though read here, their presence is not effective. And so they cannot be included in the abbreviations *ac* etc. So the *Dīp.* says : कार्यार्थश्चासकृद् ... etc. In view of some operations, *h* has been read more than once (Section I above). Similarly the code-letters *ṇ*, *k* etc. may have been read more than once for their own sake, for some operation. In that case how could they be excluded from the abbreviations *ac* etc. ? And if their inclusion is unavoidable, awkward situations may arise, e. g. in दधि णकारीयति the final *i* in *dadhi* will have to be replaced by *y* according to P. 6. 1. 77 : इको यणचि. Hence the question.

[2. 1]

(*p.* 35, *l.* 22) आचारात्। उपचारनिमित्ता प्रवृत्तिः etc. The *Mbh.* on *ācārāt* reads thus : किमिदमाचारादिति। आचार्याणामुपचारात्। नैतेष्वाचार्या अच्कार्याणि कृतवन्तः।

Kaiy., perhaps thinking that Pat's उपचार is not quite clear, further paraphrases it by व्यवहार. The argument is that Pāṇini's usage (*ācārāt*) indicates that *ṇ*, *k* etc. are not to be regarded as *ac*. Bhar. quotes an example of P. 1. 2. 25 : तृषिमृषिकृषेः ... etc. If Pāṇini had desired the *ac* status for *k*, he would not have used °मृषि° : he would have used *मृष्य्°.

(*p*. 35, *l*. 23) तत्र यथैव निपातनं बाधकं ... etc. The force of Nipātana (use of a finished word-form by Pāṇini etc.) is stronger than that of his rule, which is only abstract and theoretical. To illustrate : His rule 1. 1. 27 : सर्वादीनि सर्वनामानि reads the word सर्वनामानि without the initial *n* of *nāman* being replaced by *ṇ*, though it was necessary by his rule P. 8. 4. 3 : पूर्वपदात् संज्ञायामगः. But, after all, the Nipātana is more powerful, and so the absence of *ṇ*-substitution prevails. (Read the *Mbh*. under P. 1. 1. 27 : इह सर्वनामानीति 'पूर्वपदात् संज्ञायामगः' इति णत्वं प्राप्नोति, तस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । 'सर्वनामसंज्ञायां निपातनाण्णत्वाभावः' (वा. १) । सर्वनामसंज्ञायां निपातनाण्णत्वं न भविष्यति । किमेतन्निपातनं नाम ? अथ कः प्रतिषेधो नाम ? अविशेषेण किंचिदुक्त्वा विशेषेण 'न' इत्युच्यते, तत्र व्यक्तमाचार्यस्याभिप्रायो गम्यते, इदं न भवतीति । निपातनमप्येवंजातीयकमेव । अविशेषेण णत्वमुक्त्वा विशेषेण निपातनं क्रियते, तत्र व्यक्तमाचार्यस्याभिप्रायो गम्यते, इदं न भवतीति । [*Mbh*. I. 9. 16].) Similarly actual use of *i* (in *mṛṣi*) will supersede *y*-substitution, even if *k* were included (सत्यपि ग्रहणे) in *ac*.

(*p*. 35, *l*. 26) अथ वा 'आचाराद्' ... etc. Another alternative interpretation of 'आचारात्'. Since they are only means, they are not included in the abbreviation itself. Here प्रयोजक is the same as निमित्तिन्, what is entitled to the operation concerned, while निमित्त is only what conditions the operation; it cannot lay claim to the operation itself : it is अप्रयोजक.

[2. 2]

(*p*. 36, *l*. 1) अप्रधानत्वादिति. Another reason, this one being based on the relationship of the principal (*śeṣin*) and the subordinate (*śeṣa*). A subordinate item is meant to qualify (*viśeṣaṇatvena*) the principal; it cannot be its equal in the matter of participation in the operation (*kāryayogitvaṁ prati*). And a code-letter is such a subordinate item. It cannot therefore be included in the meaning denoted by the abbreviation.

(*p*. 36, *l*. 3) तत्र यथैव प्रकृत्यादीनां प्रत्ययसंज्ञा ... etc. The *Dīp*. gives a parallel (from grammar itself) where the same two reasons (*nimittatva* and *apradhānatva*) have been given in a different context. Commenting on P. 3. 1. 1 : प्रत्ययः, the *Mbh*. suggests that since the name *pratyaya* has been taught by way of *adhikāra*, provision should be made to prevent the name *pratyaya* from attaching itself to verbal stems, Upapadas and words expressing conditions

(*upādhi*) occurring in the Sūtras within this *adhikāra*. Then follow three Vārttikas which reject this suggestion. Of these the second *Vār.* gives the reason that the verbal stems etc. are *nimitta*, not the *nimittin*, and so they cannot claim the nomenclature of *pratyaya*; and the third one assigns the reason that they are *apradhāna* with reference to the *pratyaya* which is the principal. Read :

'प्रत्ययः' (पा. ३. १. १.)। अधिकारेणेयं प्रत्ययसंज्ञा क्रियते। सा प्रकृत्युपपदोपाधीनामपि प्राप्नोति। तस्याः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। ... अत उत्तरं पठति — 'प्रत्ययाधिकारे प्रकृत्युपपदोपाधीनामप्रतिषेधः' (वा. १)। ... अनर्थकः प्रतिषेधोऽप्रतिषेधः। प्रत्ययसंज्ञा कस्मान्न भवति ? 'निमित्तस्य निमित्तिकार्यार्थित्वादन्यत्रापि' (वा. २)। निमित्तानि हि निमित्तिकार्यार्थानि भवन्ति। किं पुनर्निमित्तम्, को वा निमित्ती ? प्रकृत्युपपदोपाधयो निमित्तम्, प्रत्ययो निमित्ती। ... 'प्रधाने कार्यसंप्रत्ययाद्वा सिद्धम्' (वा. ३)। अथ वा प्रधाने कार्यसंप्रत्ययो भवति। ... शब्दस्येदानीं किंकृतं प्राधान्यम् ? शब्दस्यापूर्वोपदेशः प्राधान्यम्। यस्यापूर्वोपदेशः स प्रधानम्। प्रकृत्युपपदोपाधयश्च निर्दिष्टाः। क्व ? धातूपदेशे प्रातिपदिकोपदेशे च। [*Mbh.* II. 1. 1 — 2. 7]

(*p.* 36, *l.* 7) कुत एतत् ? अयमभिप्रायः etc. The *Mbh.* on अप्रधानत्वात् runs thus : अप्रधानत्वाच्च। न खल्वप्येतेषामक्षु प्राधान्येनोपदेशः। क्व तर्हि ? हल्षु। कुत एतत्। एषा ह्याचार्यस्य शैली लक्ष्यते, यत् तुल्यजातीयांस्तुल्यजातीयेषु निक्षिपति — अचोऽक्षु हलो हल्षु। The words कुत एतत् challenge the view expressed in the previous sentence, viz. the reading of consonants in the vowels is not for their own sake. How do you know ? The *Dīp.* अयमभिप्रायः ... स्यादिति explains the challenge. The reading of *anubandhas* (code-letters) may have a double purpose. These consonants may have been read as much for their own sake (स्वार्थः) as for the sake of helping the formations of abbreviations. It is like the *gargādi-bidādi* lists, which serve two purposes.

The *Mbh.* answers with the words एषा ह्याचार्यस्य etc. which the *Dīp.* explains with एतत् निवर्तयति आचार्याचारादेव (line 9) etc. The teacher, following the worldly practice (viz. ब्राह्मणेषु ब्राह्मणैरेव सह भोक्ष्यते etc.) the teacher also puts vowels along with vowels and consonants along with consonants. If he puts vowels along with consonants (as in हयवरट् etc.), it is just for the sake of facility of pronunciation, and not for their own sake. Similarly here also if consonants *ṇ*, *k* etc. are read with vowels, that is only for the sake of forming abbreviations, not for their own sake. So they cannot form a part of *ac* etc.

Observation : Did the author of the *Ślokavārttika* intend two different reasons, (1) *ācāra* and (2) *apradhānatva*, or did he mean only one reason, viz. *apradhānatva*, and the *ācāra* is only a reason supporting the *apradhānatva* ? It is interesting to note that though Pat. explains the *Vār.* so as to extract two reasons out of it, he explains the *apradhānatva* on the ground of the teacher's *ācāra* (expressed by *śailī*) itself. At least Bhar. says so unmistakably : एतन्नि-

वर्तयति आचार्याचारादेव.[1] Although the major commentators do not give their opinion expressly, cf. the *Chāyā* : यद्यपि वार्त्तिकादुक्तरीत्या एक एव हेतुरिति प्रतीयते, तथापि भगवतोक्तयुक्त्या खण्डशः सचकारं[2] व्याख्यातत्वाद्धेतुद्वयमेवेति बोध्यम् । (The हेतुद्वयम् is referred to in the *Dīp.* also.)

The parallel of eating with people of one's own class (or caste) is found in the *Prad.* also : यथा लोके ब्राह्मणैः सह ब्राह्मणा भोज्यन्ते, क्षत्रियैः सह क्षत्रिया इत्येवमिहाप्याचार्येण वर्णा निर्दिष्टाः.

(*p.* 36, *l.* 11) शीले भवा शैली ... etc. Here *śīla* denotes not one's nature or disposition, but close attention or concentration of mind (*samādhāna*). The word is thus derived from the root शील समाधौ (P. Dh. I. 556). So *śailī* means doing anything after full consideration, a well thought-out procedure. This derivation also is copied by Kaiy. : शीले भवा शैली, समवधानपूर्विका प्रवृत्तिः.

[2. 3]

लोपश्च बलवत्तरः. If the above logical argument (*upapattiḥ*) is not convincing, well, here is another. The argument is that the code-letters are deleted as soon as they are uttered. They help the formations of abbreviations noly after their deletion on the strength of their recollection. When something does not exist, how can it be included in the contents of an abbreviation ? It will be perhaps better to quote Kaiy. first in order to support the argument given in its bare form above, as the *Dīp.* is here considerably corrupt. Kaiy. says : लोपश्चेति । परत्वान्नित्यत्वाद्वा 'आदिरन्त्येन —' इत्यनेनाच्संज्ञाविधानकालेऽनुबन्धानां लोपादसंनिधानादच्संज्ञा न प्रवर्तते । अनुबन्धा ह्युच्चारण एव सन्ति, इत्संज्ञाप्रतिबद्धं कार्यमसन्त एव प्रतिपादयन्ति, स्वतस्तु न किंचित् कार्यं प्रतिपद्यन्ते ।

The *Dīp.* which is here corrupt as said above, reads : अदिरन्त्येनेभवासतइदिवि संज्ञा कृता असस्वयंकार्येंन्युव्याप्रियते. In view of the argument of the *Vār.* and the passage from Kaiy. quoted above I reconstruct the *Dīp.* as आदिरन्त्येने[3] ... [अ]सत इदिति संज्ञा कृता, असन् स्वयं कार्येषु व्याप्रियते. The *Dīp.* says that the code-letters get the name *it* when they exist no more, and they are engaged in the activity of helping the formations of abbreviations 'posthumously', so to say. — For other reconstructions of this *Dīp.* attempted by the eds., see *Readings*.

1. Similarly Nāg. : अप्रधानत्वमप्याचार्याचारेण साधयति.
2. This refers to Pat.'s paraphrase अप्रधानत्वाच्च (of the original अप्रधानत्वात्).
3. I have not been able to understand भवा. Perhaps some letter may have been damaged.

(*p.* 36, *l.* 15) भावो हि कार्यार्थी ... etc. This is *Vār*. 8 on P. 1. 3. 9. Read the *Mbh.* : 'अनुबन्धलोपे भावाभावयोर्विप्रतिषेधादप्रसिद्धिः' (वा. ६)। अनुबन्धलोपे भावाभावयोर्विरोधादप्रसिद्धिः । न ज्ञायते केनाभिप्रायेण प्रसजति, केन निवृत्तिं करोतीति। 'सिद्धं त्वपवादन्यायेन' (वा. ७)। सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्? अपवादन्यायेन। किं पुनरिह तथा यथोत्सर्गापवादौ? 'भावो हि कार्यार्थोऽनन्यार्थो लोपः' (वा. ८)। कार्यं करिष्यमीत्यनुबन्ध आसज्यते, कार्यादन्यन्मा भूदिति लोपः [I. 265. 11–17]। अन्यद् is paraphrased as श्रवणम् by Nāg. So अनन्यार्थः means कार्याद् अन्यत् (= श्रवणं) मा भूदित्यर्थः.

[2. 4]

ऊकालोऽजिति वा योगः. Another solution. It is suggested here that the rule P. 1. 2. 27 : ऊकालोऽज्झ्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः be split into two as (1) ऊकालोऽच् and (2) ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः. Cf. the *Mbh.* अथ वा योगविभागः करिष्यते। 'ऊकालोऽच्' उ-ऊ-ऊ३ इत्येवंकालोऽज् भवति। ततो 'ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः'। ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतसंज्ञश्च भवत्यूकालोऽच्।

The *ac* status of *a*, *i* etc. is already established (प्रसिद्धे = [the usual] सिद्धे), as the *Dīp.* points out, on account of P. 1. 1. 71 : आदिरन्त्येन (and of *ā*, *ī* etc. by P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित्सवर्णस्य etc.). So another rule, viz. P. 1. 2. 27 : *ऊकालोऽज् (got by splitting the old rule) will serve for restriction. And this is the restriction : Only those speech sounds, appearing between *a* and *c* in the alphabet, are designated *ac*, as have an *ū*-duration; i. e. have either one, two, or three moras. The result is that consonants (*ṇ*, *k* etc.), which are used as code-letters, are precluded, because of their ½ mora, from the designation, though read between *a* — *c* in the Akṣaras. (तत्रोकालत्वमर्धमात्रिकाणां नास्तीति भावः.)

(*p.* 36, *l.* 18) यथा पूर्वपरप्रयोगे सति etc. As usual, Bhar. here gives a grammatical parallel to elucidate the concept of restriction (*niyama*). Commenting on P. 1. 4. 80 : ते प्राग् धातोः, Kāt. discusses a question, viz. whether this rule is for प्रयोगनियम (i. e. the *gati* and the *upasarga* — i. e. *pra* etc. used in connection with an activity — are to be used before the verbal root) or for संज्ञानियम (i. e. *pra* etc., used in connection with activity, are termed *gati* and *upasarga*, only when they are used before the verbal root). The second alternative (संज्ञानियम) serves as the parallel here. — In the *Dīp.* (line 20) प्राक् प्रयुज्यमानानां गत्युपसर्गसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति = °मानानामेव °संज्ञा भवति. For the parallel, read the *Mbh.* : 'ते प्राग् धातोः' (पा. १. ४. ८०)। किमिदं प्राग्धातुवचनं प्रयोगनियमार्थम् — एते प्रागेव धातोः प्रयोक्तव्याः। आहोस्वित् संज्ञानियमार्थम् — एते प्राक् चाप्राक् च प्रयोक्तव्याः, प्राक् प्रयुज्यमानानां गतिसंज्ञा भवतीति [*Mbh.* I. 345. 9–11]।

(*p.* 36, *l.* 21) एवमपि कुक्कुटः, अत्रापि प्राप्नोति। The *Mbh.* points out here that even the *yogavibhāga* does not help here. For the duration together of -*kk*- (in *kukkuṭa*) is one mora. So it is *ūkāla*. The *Dīp.* raises an objection

to this. The sound complex *-kk-* is not read in the Akṣaras. So how can it be said that it is read between $a - c$ (कथं पुनरस्यापठितस्य प्रत्याहारेऽन्तर्भावः) '. The reply is given on the *ākṛti* view. The idea is that *kk* belongs to the same *ākṛti* as *k*. The *k* read in the *Akṣaras.* (*ṛḷk*) is of the universal form. It can be realised by a one-mora *kk* as well as by a half-mora *k*. अर्धमात्र is an adjectival Bahuvrīhi. अधीना ' dependent ' i. e. for the purpose of manifestation. Similarly Kaiy. : ककाराकृतेरुपदेशान्मात्रिकस्याच्त्वं मन्यते ।

(*p.* 36, *l.* 26) अयमाह ' ह्रस्वादीनां वचनात् ... ' etc.

अयम् (for अपर, *Mbh.* ed.) may be a scribal error. Anyway the MS clearly reads a *daṇḍa* after सवर्णस्य चेति and begins a fresh sentence with अयमाह (in agreement with the *Mbh.* which begins a new sentence — indeed a new topic — with अपर आह). So it is wrong on the part of AL to delete the *daṇḍa*, and end the sentence with अयमाह, as though अयमाह is not an introduction to the following sentence (' ह्रस्वादीनां वचनात्- ' etc.). — Sw reads the MS as अपर आह itself which is not acceptable.

This *Vār.* (ह्रस्वादीनां वचनात् ...) and the preceding one (ऊकालोऽजिति वा योगस् ...) teach one and the same thing, viz. the same *yogavibhāga*. Then what is the difference between the two? The metres of the two *ślokavārttika*-s differ. Since one does not normally expect one and the same author to express one and the same idea twice in two different metres, it has to be assumed that the *Mbh.* has brought together two different stanzas in which two different authors had expressed one and the same idea, each in his own way.

Bhar., however, sees a new point here. He thinks that the present *ślokavārttika* is based on the *vyakti* view, and that the *savarṇagrahaṇa* is not ruled out here, unlike in the preceding *ślokavārttika* (... व्यक्तिनिर्देशोऽयम् ... अणुदित्° इति).

Readings : (1) (*p.* 35, *l.* 22) MS आचारन्निति न प्रवृत्तिः; Sw तत्प्र° (for उपचारनिमित्ता प्र° as in AL). I admit the original text must be still different. The text accepted here is only provisional. — (2) (*p.* 35, *ll.* 22–23) the *Mbh.* : नैतेष्वाचार्या अच्कार्याणि कृतवन्तः. — (3) (*p.* 35, *l.* 26) MS आचारादिम; Sw °रादि (ति इद) म°. — (4) (*p.* 36, *l.* 2) MS शेषणं; Sw (वि)शेषणं (for शेषिणं). — After this Sw ins. (अन्यं). — (5) (*p.* 36, *l.* 4) MS हेतुश्च; Sw हेतोश्च (for हेतु-). — (6) (*p.* 36, *ll.* 12–13) MSAL प्रतिप(AL °पा)द्यस्य (for °द्यस्त्व as in Sw). — (7) (*p.* 36, *ll.* 13–14) AL 'आदिरन्त्येन सहेता' इति संज्ञा कृता असत्स्वपि कार्येषु व्याप्रियते इति ज्ञानम्; Sw °न्त्येन इ(ति) भवा सत इदिविसंज्ञा कृता अस(त्) स्वय (?) कार्येषु व्या° ... ज्ञातम् । See Notes. — The MS repeats इतः प्रतिपद्या ... न्त्येन इति after व्याप्रियते. — (8) (*p.* 36, *l.* 18) AL ऊकालेन (for कालेन). — (9) (*p.* 36, *l.* 21) MS नास्तीच्भावः; Sw नास्ती(त्यच्त्वा)भावः. —(10) *Mbh.* इत्यत्रापि. —(11) (*p.* 36, *l.* 22)

MSAL पठितस्य. — (12) (*p.* 36, *l.* 23) MS मात्रकाधाना; AL मात्राधीना (for मात्रिकाधीना. — (13) (*p.* 36, *l.* 26) Sw (as in the *Mbh.* ed.) अपर आह (for अयमाह). — (14) (*p.* 37, *l.* 1) MS कियद्यतदुकालो; AL किमेतत्। ऊकालो. — (15) (*p.* 37, *l.* 5) MSSw तस्मा(द्)णादीनि. — (16) (*p.* 37, *l.* 6) Sw इष्टं कार्यं.

VI

The topic discussed here is: किमर्थमन्तस्थानामणसूपदेश: 'why are the semivowels read among the *aṇ* phonemes?'

इदमत्र पृच्छ्यमानम् ... etc. Here Bhar. explains the real significance of the question raised in the *Mbh.* The *Mbh.* apparently asks the reason for reading the semivowels (... यवरट्। लण्।) among the *aṇ* phonemes. Actually there is no difference of opinion about the *place* of the semivowels. They have to be read there so that they can be covered by the abbreviation *iṇ* so as to ensure, e. g., cerebralisation of *s* of the case-ending *su* in forms like *gīrṣu, halṣu* etc. (cf. P. 8. 3. 57: इण्को: and 59: आदेशप्रत्ययो:). The real question is: what is the use of giving *aṇ* status to the semivowels? They have no homogeneous phonemes whom they could usefully denote for some grammatical operation. So why does Pāṇini use the abbreviation *aṇ* (किमर्थं ... णकारेण प्रत्याहार:) instead of *ac* (न पुनश्चकारेण)? As Kaiy. puts it more pointblank: 'अजुदित्सवर्णस्य' इति कस्मान्न कृतमिति भाव:। He almost repeats Bhar. in the remaining part also: इण्ग्रहणेन ग्रहणार्थेस्त्वन्तस्थानामत्रावश्यकर्तव्य उपदेशो गीर्ष्वित्यादौ मूर्धन्यो यथा स्यादिति। To this Nāg. adds: तेनात्र स्थाने किमर्थं उपदेश इति तु नार्थ: ...।

Incidentally, Bhar's use of the form पृच्छ्यमानम् (in the Nominative) is a howler, and very strange as coming from a महावैयाकरण like Bhar. Such an usage is prohibited by Pāṇini in his rule: लट: शतृशानचावप्रथमासमानाधिकरणे.

(*p.* 37, *l.* 12) ननु च भेदो भवति. The *Dīp.* here skips over a portion of the *Mbh.* where it is shown that the *aṇ* status for the semivowels is necessary to account for forms like सय्ँय्ँयन्ता (with 3 *y*-s). The forms can be derived in two different ways, depending on whether *parasavarṇa* (P. 8. 4. 58: अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्ण:) is *asiddha* or not in relation to reduplication (P. 8. 4. 47: अनचि च). The following are the two ways in which the forms can be derived:

(1) (On the view that *parasavarṇa* is *asiddha*:) सम्यन्ता > संयन्ता (P. 8. 3. 23: मोऽनुस्वार:) > स·· ·· यन्ता (P. 8. 4. 47: अनचि च) > स··य्ँयन्ता (P. 8. 4. 58: अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्ण:) > सय्ँय्ँयन्ता (P. 8. 4. 58: अनुस्वारस्य ...). Here, in this last stage, the replacement of the first Anusvāra by *ẏ̃* requires that the following *ẏ̃* be designated as *yay*, which in turn depends on the *aṇ* status of *y* which can then include *ẏ̃* also.

(2) On the view that *parasavarṇa* is *siddha*: सम्यन्ता > संयन्ता (P. 8. 3. 23: मोऽनुस्वार:) > सय्ँयन्ता (P. 8. 4. 58: अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्ण:) > सय्ँय्ँ-

यन्ता (P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च). Here if *ẙ̃* is to be reduplicated, it must have the designation *yar*, which depends on its being comprehended by *y*, which latter must therefore have *aṇ* status for this *savarṇagrahaṇa*.

So if reduplication is desired, *ẙ̃* has to be a part of *yay* or *yar*, which requires अन्तस्थानामण्सूपदेशः.

At this stage the *Mbh.* remarks that there is no harm even if there is no reduplication. This instantly provokes the retort ननु च भेदो भवति, with which we are concerned. Now read the *Mbh.* :

इह सयँ्यन्ता सवँ्वत्सरः यलँ्लोकं तलँ्लोकमिति परसवर्णस्यासिद्धत्वादनुस्वारस्यैव द्विर्वचनम् । तत्र परस्य परसवर्णे कृते तस्य ययग्रहणेन ग्रहणात् पूर्वस्यापि परसवर्णो यथा स्यात् । नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । वक्ष्यत्येतत् । द्विर्वचने परसवर्णत्वं सिद्धं वक्तव्यमिति । यावता सिद्धत्वमुच्यते परसवर्ण एव तावद्भवति । परसवर्णे तर्हि कृते तस्य यर्-ग्रहणेन ग्रहणाद् द्विर्वचनं यथा स्यात् । मा भूद् द्विर्वचनम् । ननु च भेदो भवति ।

Here, of course भेद means रूपभेद. The *Mbh.* thus points out how रूपभेद is made by the presence or absence of reduplication : सति द्विर्वचने त्रियकारम् (i. e. सयँ्यँ्यन्ता), असति द्विर्वचने द्वियकारम् (i. e. सयँ्यन्ता) ।

(*p*. 37, *l*. 12) श्रुतिकृतं भेदमध्यवसाय ब्रवीति. This is a remark on the *Mbh.* ननु च भेदो भवति. It is difficult to perceive auditorily the difference between सयँ्यँ्यन्ता and सयँ्यन्ता if there is one (cf. Nāg. : ननु न भेदोऽनुपलब्धेः). So, the *Dīp*. remarks that the *Mbh.* makes this statement on the assumption that there *is* a difference in audition. Kaiy. observes that in this view it is very subtle and so difficult to perceive (अस्त्येव भेदः सूक्ष्मत्वात्तु दुर्लक्ष्यः).

(*p*. 37, *l*. 12) तदेतदत्यन्तं संदिग्धं ... etc. There is a long-drawn argument here in the *Mbh.* in which Bhar. is apparently not interested (or else we have to suppose that some portion of the *Dīp*. is lost) and he hastens to the concluding part of the *Mbh.* The argument concerns the point whether even with reduplication a form with three *y*-s (सयँ्यँ्यन्ता) is available at all since, even then, one *ẙ̃* is going to be deleted by P. 8. 4. 64. : हलो यमां यमि लोपः. As against this it is pointed out that P. 8. 4. 64 is only an optional rule (as the expression *anyatarasyām* continues in it from P. 8. 4. 62 : झयो होऽन्यतरस्याम्). So, optionally सयँ्यँ्यन्ता is available. But the opponent points out that this optionality is only an inference (based on the *jñāpaka* of the rule P. 8. 4. 49 : शरोऽचि) which may or may not be correct. Hence Pat's final observation तदेतत् संदिग्धं वर्तते आचार्याणाम् ... Bhar. supports the doubtfulness (संदिग्धत्वम्) of the inference on the ground that such inference, based on a *jñāpaka* is always inconclusive (अनैकान्तिकत्वात् अनुमानस्य).

Readings : (1) (*p*. 37, *l*. 7) ALSw (against the MS) अन्तःस्था°. Similarly below. — (2) (*p*. 37, *l*. 11) Sw अनन्तस्थकानि. — (3) (*p*. 37, *l*. 13) MSAL °काद्य(MS °द्ये)नुमिमते.

[*laṇ* / 6]

The problem discussed under this Sū. is the reading twice of *ṇ* as a code-letter (in Sū. 1. *aiuṇ* and 6. *laṇ*) leading to the uncertainty as to whether, when the abbreviations *aṇ* and *iṇ* are used, they are to be understood as formed with the first *ṇ*, or the second one. Cf. the *Mbh.* : अयं णकारो द्विरनुबध्यते, पूर्वश्चैव परश्च । तत्राण्ग्रहणेष्विण्ग्रहणेषु च संदेहो भवति — पूर्वेण वा स्युः, परेण चेति ।

[1]

अत्र प्रकरणे षट् प्रकारा उपन्यस्ताः. Bhar. here enumerates six guiding principles. Although all six are thrown together, it has to be noted, they really fall into two categories. The problem is that in every case it is to be decideed whether the principle of *āsatti* 'vicinity' is to be followd (so that we take the abbreviations with the first *ṇ*), or that of *vyāpti* 'pervasion' (with the result that the two abbreviations are understood with the second *ṇ*). The four principles, *sāmarthya* 'force', i. e. the otherwise meaninglessness, etc. help in deciding where *āsatti* is to be followed and where *vyāpti*.

(*p*. 37, *l*. 17) आसत्तेर्न्याय्यात् ... etc. This passage seems to mention the advantages resulting from the observance of the two principles, *āsatti* and *vyāpti*. When there is no reason to reject what has presented itself first (क्रमव्यतिक्रमे च प्रयोजनाभावात्), it is not proper to reject it and pass on to something else. The principle of *āsatti* thus is similar to what is called प्रथमोपस्थितस्य त्यागे मानाभावात् (corresponding to the English 'First came, first served'). So the result of *āsatti* is the understanding of the abbreviations with the first *ṇ* (पूर्वेण स्यात्).

The advantage in following *vyāpti* is that many more phonemes get the advantage of the designation (*aṇ*, *iṇ*). So 'the more, the merrier!' So by following this principle, the abbreviations are understood to be formed with the second *ṇ*.

तत्र लक्ष्यवशात् किमासत्तिः ... etc. (*l*. 19)=कस्मिन् लक्ष्ये आसत्तिः, कस्मिंश्च व्याप्तिः.

तत्र द्वयोर(ण्) ग्रहणयोः ... etc.

Observation : The whole paragraph, it must be said, is not happily worded. Firstly, as said above, the six principles have not been divided in two clear-cut groups, and the relationship of क्रमव्यतिक्रमे च प्रयोजनाभावात् and भूयसां ग्रहणम् with the four principles *sāmarthya* etc., and whether the two are included in any of these four, is not clear. Thirdly, if व्यतिक्रमे च प्रयोजनाभावात् states a

condition, then one rather expected प्रयोजनाभावे (in the locative). Also *ca* seems to be superfluous. Finally the idea in लक्ष्यवशात् किमासत्तिः ... etc. would have been better expressed by something like कस्मिन् लक्ष्ये आसत्तिः, कस्मिंश्च व्याप्तिः, as already said. (Cf. Nāg.'s comment — his very brief introduction to the discussion — क्व प्रत्यासत्तिः, क्व व्याप्तिरिति संदेह इत्यर्थः on Kaiy. : किं प्रत्यासत्तिराश्रीयतेऽथ व्याप्तिरिति संदेहः ।)

(*p.* 37, *l.* 21) अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्येति. After the statement of the problem, a question is asked in the *Mbh.* to elicit information : कतमस्मिंस्तावदणग्रहणे संदेहः ? The questioner is going to show that there is everywhere some clue or indication which clinches the issue in favour of either this or that *ṇ*. After the cases of *aṇ* in P. 6. 3. 111 and P. 7. 4. 13 are disposed of, comes up the case of *aṇ* in P. 8. 4. 57 : अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्यानुनासिकः (which teaches that an *aṇ* phoneme, occurring before the pause, is nasalized optionally, unless it is technically called *pragṛhya*). When this Sū. is brought in with the remark : अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यणग्रहणे संदेहः, the *Mbh.* continues :

असंदिग्धं पूर्वेण, न परेण । कुत एतत् ? पराभावात् । न हि पदान्ताः परेऽणः सन्ति ।

The *Dīp.* is shocked at the *Mbh.* statement : न हि पदान्ताः परेऽणः सन्ति. It says it cannot understand the idea (न ज्ञायते केनाभिप्रायेणाह) behind this statement since, it argues, Pat. has himself used in his Bhāṣya in Adhy. VIII[1] a phrase *vṛkṣav karoti*. Here is a case where *v* is Pada-final and *v* certainly belongs to the group of phonemes derived by an abbreviation *aṇ* formed with the second *ṇ* (अइउण् । ... हयवरट् । लण् ।).

The expression *vṛkṣav* (which looks very strange and is evidently coined by grammarians) is said to be an agent noun from a secondary (denominative) verb *vṛkṣavi* (< *vṛkṣa* + *v* + *i* [*ṇic*]). There is no one view where *v* comes from. Thus

(1) According to one view, वृक्षवि comes from वृक्षवत्+णिच् in the sense वृक्षवन्तमाचष्टे (by तत्करोति तदाचष्टे), where the possessive suffix वत्>व् (with टिलोप). Kaiy. does not approve of this view on the ground that the whole suffix वत् will have to be dropped on account of the इष्ठवद्भाव.

(2) According to another view, from वृक्ष + √व्रश्च् + क्विप् (= O) we get an agent noun वृक्षवृश्च्, ' one who cuts a tree ', which, with the further addition of णिच् (again in the sense : तत्करोति तदाचष्टे) gives वृक्षवि (with the टिलोप as above).

1. The phrase वृक्षव् करोति occurs in the *Mbh.* on P. 8. 3. 17 : भोभगो . . . in connection with the deletion of the final *v* of *vṛkṣav* by P. 8. 3. 22 : हलि सर्वेषाम् .

(3) According to a third explanation given by Kaiy. himself, **वृक्षवि** comes from (**वृक्ष + √वी + क्विप्**) > **वृक्षव्** with further addition of **णिच्**.

To this denominative verb **वृक्षवि**[1] is added a suffix to form an agent noun. The ultimately resulting form is **वृक्षव्** (with *ṭi-lopa*, of course).

Incidentally, Kaiy. quotes under P. 8. 3. 17 the *Mbh.* statement as : **तथा हि 'लण्' इत्यत्रोक्तं 'न पदान्ता हलोऽणः सन्ति' इति ।**

Commenting on our present *Mbh.* passage : **न हि पदान्ताः परेऽणः सन्ति** Kaiy. also raised this question of the apparent self-contradiction in the *Mbh.* His solution is that the *Mbh.* is not to be taken in an absolute sense. The *Mbh.* does not deny the possibility of *v* etc. occurring as finals. They may. What is denied is their possibility of nasalization (**न हि सन्ति = न हि कार्यभाजः सन्ति**). This is sought to be achieved by taking the negation in *apragṛhya* as of the nature of *paryudāsa*. Since the name *pragṛhya* is possible for vowels (*ac*) only, nasalization also is possible for vowels only. Read : **ननु च 'भोभगो ...' इत्यत्राश्ग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनं वक्ष्यते, 'वृक्षव् करोति' इत्यत्र 'हलि सर्वेषाम्' इति लोपो मा भूदिति । तत् कथमुच्यते 'न हि पदान्ता ...' इति ? उच्यते । 'अप्रगृह्यस्य' इति पर्युदासेनाच एवानुनासिकेन भाव्यं न तु हल इत्युक्तं 'न हि पदान्ताः' इति । कार्यभाज इत्यर्थः ।**

Raghunāth Shastri, on the other hand, remarks in his foot-note to the *Mbh.* : **वस्तुतस्तु अत्र भाष्ये वृक्षवादीनामनुक्त्याऽष्टमाध्यायस्थं भाष्यमेकदेश्युक्तिरिति ।**

(*p.* 37, *l.* 23) **गृधेर्यङ्लुगन्तस्य ... अजर्घाः.** The *aṇ* abbreviation which is now being considered is the one which occurs in P. 1. 1. 51 : **उरण् रपरः** which teaches that an *aṇ* substitute for *ṛ* is always followed by *r*. When it is maintained that this also is with the first *ṇ* and that **न ह्यु: स्थाने परेऽणः सन्ति**, the objector points out that in *kartṛ + artham = kartrartham*, there is a *r* (a *paro'ṇ*), and so there will have to be another *r* after it, resulting into **kartrr-artham*. On this he is assured by the defendant that one of the two *r*-s will be deleted by P. 8. 4. 64 : **हलो यमां यमि लोपः**, or better by P. 8. 3. 14 : **रो रि** where the deletion is obligatory. The objector objects to this, saying that the rule **रो रि**, which applies to word-final only, will not be available here. The defendant replies by saying that **रो रि** cannot be restricted to word-finals, for in that case it will not be available in forms like **अजर्घाः**, where **रो रि** is universally admitted as applying : **अयं तर्हि नित्यो लोपः 'रो रि' इति । 'पदान्तस्य' इत्येवं सः । न शक्यः सः 'पदान्तस्य' विज्ञातुम् । इहि हि लोपो न स्यात् — जर्गृधेर्लङ् अजर्घाः इति ।**

1. वृक्षवयतेः in the *Mbh.* is Abl. of वृक्षवयति which denotes the denominative *dhātu* वृक्षवि by the maxim : इक्श्तिपौ धातुनिर्देशे.

Bhar. gives some information on the formation of अजर्घाः in the *Dīp.* गृधेर्यङ्लुगन्तस्य लङि सिपि रूपम् अजर्घाः इति । It means *ajarghāḥ* is 2nd pers. sing. Imperfect (active), from the Intensive (यङ्लुगन्त) of √*gṛdh*. Kaiy. gives the process in detail : गृधेर्यङ्लुकि रुगागमेऽभ्यासस्य कृते लङि सिपि शब्लुकि गुणरपरत्वे सिल्लोपभष्भावजश्त्वरुत्वरलोपदीर्घत्वेषु रूपम् । The process can be illustrated as follows :

अ(ट्) + जर्गृध्[1] + शब्लुक् + स् (लङ्)	
अ + जर्गर्ध् + स्	(Guṇa P. 7. 3. 86 : पुगन्तलघूपधस्य ।)
अ + जर्गर्ध् + 0	(P. 6. 1. 68 : हल्ङ्याब्भ्यो ... ।)
अ + जर्घर्ध्	(P. 8. 2. 37 : एकाचो बशो भष् ... ।)
अ + जर्घर्द्	(P. 8. 2. 39 : झलां जशोऽन्ते ।)
अ + जर्घर्रु	(P. 8. 2. 75 : दश्च ।)
* अ + जर्घ०र्	(P. 8. 3. 14 : रो रि)
अ + जर्घार्	(P. 6. 3. 111 : ढ्रलोपे पूर्वस्य ... ।)
अजर्घाः	(P. 8. 3. 15 : खरवसानयोर्विसर्जनीयः ।)

If one regarded the rule रो रि as applying to pada-final only, there will be difficulty in deleting one (i. e. the preceding) *r* (in the stage marked with an asterisk above).

Incidentally it may be pointed out that the form *ajarghāḥ* was probably looked upon as difficult to derive by those who were not deep-read in grammar. It occurs along with two others in a witty stanza which gives these forms to test the scholarship of the aspiring bridegroom. Read :

नाचीकमत जानाति यो न जानाति वर्वरीः ।
अजर्घा यो न जानाति तस्मै कन्या न दीयते ॥

Certainly he must have been a very sharp-minded grammarian who first discovered the root of *ajarghāḥ* in √*gṛdh* when not a single letter is common to the two !

(*p.* 37, *l.* 24) धातुग्रहणं करोति. The objector brings forward another case of उरण् रपरः. In Genitive pl. of *ṛ*- stems, *mātṝṇām* etc., *ṛ* is replaced by *ṝ* (P. 6. 4. 3 : नामि ।). So here is a *paro'ṇ* in the place of *ṛ*, which will have to be followed by *r*. The argument : न ह्युः स्थाने परेऽणः सन्ति will not do. This objection is met by the defendant in the *Mbh.* thus : आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नात्र रपरत्वं

1. Reduplication P. 6. 1. 9, हलादिशेष 7. 4. 60, *a* for *ṛ* in the reduplication P. 7. 4. 66, *j* for the initial *g* P. 7. 4. 62, *ja*>*jar* 7. 4. 91.

भवतीति, यदयम् 'ऋत इद्धातोः' इति धातुग्रहणं करोति. His argument thus is that the reading of the word *dhātu* in P. 7. 1. 100 : ऋत इद्धातोः is an indication, that *ṛ* is not followed by *r* here. How ? The object of reading *dhātu* in that rule is to prevent *i*-substitution in non-roots (like *mātṝ-*). If *r* were to follow in the forms like *mātṝṇām* (now **mātṝrṇām*), Pāṇini would not have read *dhātu* in this rule. He would simply have read it as **ṝta it*, and still *i*-substitution would have been prevented, since the *aṅga* (in **mātṝrṇām*) no longer ends in *-ṝ* (but in *-ṝr-*). Still Pāṇini reads *dhātu*. That indicates that there is a possibility of *i*-substitution, which in turn hints at the absence of *r* following *ṝ* in *mātṝṇām* etc.

(*p.* 37, *l.* 24) शक्यतेऽत्र वक्तुम् etc. Bhar. is not interested in explaining the *jñāpaka*. He has a different observation to make. Here he is trying a sort of what is called *jñāpaka-vighaṭana*.

The defendant had explained the reading of the word *dhātoḥ* (in P. 7. 1. 100) on the assumption that *ṝ* is not followed by *r* in *mātṝṇām* etc. even if the abbreviation *aṇ* were with the second *ṇ*. Now the objector explains it on a different assumption. The absence of *r* can be accounted for differently. It can be said that the *ṝ* in *mātṝṇām* etc. is not to be regarded as a substitute in the place of *ṛ*. The relation between the two is not of *sthānin* and *ādeśa* (न स्थान्यादेशभावः). There is just an addition or augmentation (*upajāyate*) of one mora to the original one. The original vowel is simply 'lengthened' (as we would say), not that the short one is replaced by a different, long one (the usual relation). Since there is no *ṛsthānika aṇ*, there is no *r* which would follow. In the absence of such *r* the stem (*mātṝ-*) now ends in *ṝ*, giving thus an occasion to P. 7. 1. 100 to apply. To prevent *i*-substitution which would have followed, Pāṇini read *dhātoḥ* in that rule, claims the objector. If the abbreviation *aṇ* is with the second *ṇ*, the word *dhātoḥ* cannot prevent it.

The *Dīp.* एवं तु चिकीर्षतीत्यादिदोषो विरुध्यते shows why this argument cannot stand. It conflicts with the objection taken in the *Mbh.* in the next sentence इहापि तर्हि न प्राप्नोति — चिकीर्षति, जिहीर्षति. If *ṝ* in *mātṝ-* is not a substitute of *ṛ* but the same *ṛ* now lengthened, the same can be said of *ṛ* which appears at one stage in the process of derivation of forms like *cikīrṣati* (Desid. fr. *kṛ*, 3. sing.; *kṛ* > *kṝ* [P. 6. 4. 16 : अज्झनगमां सनि] > *cikṝ* > *cikir* [P. 7. 1. 100] > *cikīr* [P. 8. 2. 77 : हलि च] + *sa*(*n*) + *ti* = *cikīrṣati*). Since this *ṝ* is not a *ṛsthānika aṇ*, there is no possibility of *r* following. So there is no bar to the *i*-substitution (*cikṝ* > *cikir*) taught by P. 7. 1. 100. But the Bhāṣyakāra says there that *i*-substitution cannot be had in *cikīrṣati* etc. So, the view suggested in the *Dīp.* मात्रा केवलमुपजायते, न स्थान्यादेशभावः has to be rejected.

(*p.* 37, *l.* 25) इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति, चिकीर्षति ... This is already explained in the last paragraph. Now an objection is taken against it here in the *Dīp.* अत्र चोद्यते — धातुग्रहणात् ... etc. The objector says that the apprehension expressed there, viz. इहापि ... (इत्वं) न प्राप्नोति, चिकीर्षति, is unfounded. It was shown, he maintains, on the indication of *dhātoḥ* in P. 7. 1. 100 that ṝ is not followed by *r* in such cases. Then what is there to prevent *i*-substitution from taking place? (This objection, not appearing in the *Prad.*, finds a place in the *Uddyota* : ननु धातुग्रहणेन ऋकारस्य दीर्घो न रपर इति ज्ञापनात् 'अज्झन ...' इति दीर्घस्याप्यरपरत्वात् कथमत्रेत्वाप्राप्तिः.)

The *Dīp.* अयमभिप्रायः etc. answers this objection by giving a correct explanation of the *jñāpaka*. The *liṅga*, i. e. the reading of the word *dhātoḥ* in P. 7. 1. 100 does not preclude *r* in *all* cases of ṛ > ṝ. It does so *only* in the case of non-root words; in roots (*dhātu*) the coming in of *r* is not barred (धातुग्रहणादधातोरेव रपरत्वं निवर्तितम्, धातोस्तु स्यादेव). Such being the case, when the form is in the stage **cikṝr*- the stem no longer ends in -ṝ, and so there is no prospect of *i*-substitution. — अनन्त्यत्वादप्राप्तिः means ऋकारस्य अनन्त्यत्वात् इत्वस्य अप्राप्तिः. Kaiy. gives the same explanation, almost verbtim : धातुग्रहणेन हि लिङ्गेनाधातोरेव रपरत्वं निवर्तितम्। धातोस्तु रपरत्वे सत्यनन्त्यत्वान्न प्राप्नोति ...।

(*p.* 38, *l.* 2) अथ वा धातुग्रहणमेवमर्थं ... etc. An alternative solution. The reading of *dhātoḥ* serves a different purpose. There is *r*-suffixion everywhere where ṛ>ṝ. What *dhātoḥ* does is to ensure *i*-substitution for ṝ of a verbal root, whichever place that ṝ may be occupying in that root (यत्रतत्रस्थस्य). So not ऋकारान्तस्य अङ्गस्य इत्वम् but अङ्गस्य य ऋकारः (यत्रतत्रस्थः) तस्य इत्वम्.

(*p.* 38, *l.* 4) मा भूदेवम्। उपधाया एव भविष्यति। A reply to इहापि तर्हि न प्राप्नोति। चिकीर्षति.... Doesn't matter, says the defendant. If *i*-substitution is not available as P. 7. 1. 100 : ॠत इद्धातोः does not apply because the stem does not end in ṝ, doesn't matter. The very next rule : उपधायाश्च (which applies to a penultimate ṝ and provides for *i*-substitution, as e. g. in *kīrtayati* from √*kṝt*) will serve the same purpose.

(*p.* 38, *l.* 5) इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति, मातॄणामिति. To make the meaning of this *Mbh.* clear, the *Dīp.* supplies the necessary words : अन्तरेण धातुग्रहणम्. This is the idea : It was suggested by the defendant above that *dhātoḥ* in P. 7. 1. 100 has no other purpose than to suggest that there is no *r*-suffixion in *mātṝṇām* etc. He explained that reading only on that assumption. But that is not correct. It can be explained on another assumption also. If *dhātoḥ* is not read in P 7.1.100 : ॠत इद्धातोः it cannot come down in P. 7. 1. 101 : उपधायाश्च by *anuvṛtti*. In the absence of *dhātoḥ* here, there will be *i*-substitution in **mātṝrṇām* etc. also. Since *dhātoḥ* can thus have a distinct utility (prohibiting the *i*-substitution in *mātṝṇām*

etc.) even when *r* suffixion is there it cannot be a *jñāpaka* for the absence of *r*-suffixion. In the face of this rival hypothesis, that of the defendant cannot be said to be conclusive. Read Nāg.: एवं च रपरत्वेऽपि मातॄणामित्यादौ 'उपधायाश्च' इतीत्त्ववारणेन धातुग्रहणस्य चारितार्थ्येन रपरत्वनिवृत्तौ न ज्ञापकतेत्यर्थः। So the *Mbh.* concludes : तस्मात् तत्र धातुग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्।

The upshot of the discussion so far is that if the abbreviation *aṇ* in उरण् रपरः is with the second *ṇ*, it will be difficult to prevent *r*-suffixion in forms like *mātṝṇām.*

(*p.* 38, *l.* 6) यश्चोपदिष्टः ... 'उदात्तादिषु रपरत्वम्' ... etc. The *Dīp.* is here referring to the *Vār.* 5 : उदात्तादिषु च on P. 1. 1 51 : उरण् रपरः. A problem arises when substitutes like the *udātta* are taught. To illustrate : P. 3. 3. 94 : स्त्रियां क्तिन् teaches a suffix (*k*)*ti*(*n*) in the sense of *bhāva* etc. According to P. 6. 1. 197 : ञ्नित्यादिर्नित्यम्, the word-element ending in, say, a suffix with *n* as a code-letter (e. g. कृति) has the Udātta accent on the initial syllable (*kṛ́ti.*). Technically the rule is explained to mean that an unaccented vowel (*ac*) is replaced by an accented one. Now whichever vowel is substituted will be accented. All right. But which one is to be substituted in the place of *ṛ* of *kṛ* when *-ti* follows ? This is decided on the basis of *sthāne'ntaratamaḥ*, and so *ṛ́* itself comes in the place of *ṛ*. Now, if *aṇ* in उरण् रपरः is with second *ṇ*, the substitute *ṛ́* will have to be *ṛ́r*. So Kāt. (*Vār.* 5) says that *r*-suffixion will have to be prohibited (*Mbh.* : 'उदात्तादिषु च (*Vār.* 5)'। किम्? रपरत्वस्य प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। कृतिः, हृतिः। कृतम्, हृतम्। प्रकृतम्, प्रहृतम्। नॄँः पाहि।).

So the *Dīp.* concludes : स तु दोषोऽस्त्येव परेण णकारेण ग्रहणे सति.

(*p.* 38, *l.* 7) एवं सामर्थ्यात् व्याप्तौ बाधितायाम् ... etc. In all the cases of *aṇ* considered so far, the decision has been finally given against *vyāpti* on the basis of *sāmarthya* 'meaningfulness', i. e. otherwise-superfluousness. A cursory review of the *Mbh.* will make this clear :

कतमस्मिंस्तावदणग्रहणे संदेहः? 'ढ्लोपे पूर्वस्य दीर्घोऽणः' इति।... एवं तर्हि सामर्थ्यात् पूर्वेण, न परेण। यदि हि परेण स्याद्, अणग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात्। 'ढ्लोपे पूर्वस्य दीर्घोऽचः' इत्येव ब्रूयात्। अथ वैतदपि न ब्रूयात्। अचो ह्येतद् भवति — ह्रस्वो दीर्घः प्लुत इति।

अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यणग्रहणे संदेहः — 'केऽणः' इति। ... एवं तर्हि सामर्थ्यात् पूर्वेण, न परेण। यदि हि परेण स्याद्...।

अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यणग्रहणे संदेहः — 'अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्य' इति। ... एवं तर्हि सामर्थ्यात् पूर्वेण, न परेण। यदि हि परेण स्याद्...

Similarly the last case finished just now, i. e. 'उरण् रपरः' is also settled on the same ground — एवं तर्हि सामर्थ्यात् पूर्वेण, न परेण। यदि हि परेण स्याद्, अणग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात्। 'उरच् रपरः' इत्येव ब्रूयात्।

The supersession of *vyāpti* means establishment of *āsatti* = *pūrveṇa grahaṇam.*

The *Dīp.* introduces the *Mbh.* अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यण्ग्रहणे संदेहः [-'अणुदित् सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः' इति] with the words अतः प्रसिद्धेः पृच्छति. The question actually comes after the *Mbh.* pratīka (अस्मिंस्तर्हि... संदेहः), viz. किमत्र प्रसिद्धिरथ व्याप्तिः? Are we to accept here *āsattiḥ* (because of its *prasiddhi*), or *vyāpti*? (It is rather strange that the word *āsatti* does not appear here. Also in lines 12–13, *āsatti* should have been mentioned in some such form as आसत्तिः सिद्धा.) The question is asked because, as the *Dīp.* says, what is established once (say, on the basis of *sāmarthya*) need not be valid in each and every case. In some case the opposite may have to be accepted, as what is established can be set aside on the basis of indicatory sign प्रसिद्धिर्लिङ्गेन बाध्यते।).

(*p.* 38, *l.* 10) सवर्णेऽण्ग्रहणम् इति। This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.*: 'सवर्णेऽण् तपरं (*v. l.* तु परं) ह्युर्ऋत्' (श्लो. वा.)। यदयम् 'उर्ऋत्' इत्यृकारे तपरकरणं करोति, तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः — परेण, न पूर्वेणेति। This is the only case where *aṇ* has to be understood with the second *ṇ*. The clue is the *taparakaraṇa* (*ṛt*) in the rule: P. 7. 4. 7: उर्ऋत्. The rule lays down substitution of short *ṛ* in the place of short or long penultimate *ṛ* vowel of a verbal root in the Redupl. Aorist. Thus we get अचीकृतत् (fr. √*kṝt* 'commemorate') by the process अ + कृत् (> चीकृत्) + णिच् + चङ् + त् (लुङ्). Here Pāṇini prevents the substitution of *ṝ* (which would otherwise have become due by *āntaratamya*) by resorting to *t*-suffixion ('तपरस्तत्कालस्य'). But how could *ṝ* become due by the utterance of *ṛ* (i. e. a short *ṛ*), unless in the Sū. अणुदित् सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः the abbreviation *aṇ* is understood with the second *ṇ*? If the abbreviation were with the first *ṇ*, then *ṛ* would be obviously left outside. Also, in that case *ṝ* would not be a *sthānin*, for the same reasons. Here Bhar's explanation is rather brief, against which Kaiy. gives rather a full explanation. Read: अचीकृतदिति ऋकारस्य ऋकार एव यथा स्यात् ॠकारो मा भूदित्येवमर्थं तपरत्वं क्रियते। यदि च पूर्वेण णकारेणाण्ग्रहणं स्यात्, ॠकारो ऽनण्त्वाद् भिन्नकालस्य ग्राहक एव न भवतीति ॠकारो नैव स्थानी, नाप्यादेशः प्रसज्जतीति किं तपरत्वेन? कृतं तज्ज्ञापकं परेणाण्ग्रहणस्य. Incidentally it may be mentioned that ॠकारो नैव स्थानी is missing in the *Dīp.*

(*p.* 38, *l.* 11) ननु च भाव्यमानेन ग्रहणं न ... etc. An objection against taking the above *t*-suffixion as an indicative sign of परेण णकारेण. The objector says that a phoneme which is being produced (*bhāvyamāna*; taught as a substitute) does not have the capacity of comprehending its homogeneous phonemes according to the maxim भाव्यमानेन etc. In the rule P. 7. 4. 7, *ṛ*, the substitute which is taught, is *bhāvyamāna*. How can it comprehend its long counterpart (*ṝ*) then? And if not, where is the need of *t*-suffixion for restricting the quantity

of the substitute ? So the *t* suffixion is not an indication of *aṇ* here being formed *pareṇa ṇakāreṇa*.

The *Dīp.* partly admits the objection (सत्यम् । एवमेतत्) but justifies the argument in अस्ति तु ग्रहणप्रसङ्गो ... etc. This sentence is not clear. Kaiy. does not raise this objection but fortunately Nāg. (and before him, the *Kāśikā*) does. According to him, *ṛ*(*t*) has been mentioned in that rule not so much as a substitute to be newly taught, but rather to re-establish[1] it by warding off other substitutes like *ir* (P. 7. 1. 101), *ar* (P. 7. 3. 86) etc. Preservation is not a new creation. Read : न च भाव्यमानत्वेन सवर्णग्रहणाप्रसक्तेस्तद्वैयर्थ्यम्, तपरत्वाभावे आदेशान्तरनिवृत्त्यर्थत्वेन स्वरूपाभ्यनुज्ञानार्थत्वेनापूर्वबोध्यत्वाभावेन चाविधेयत्वात् । कृते तु तपरत्वे भाव्यमानतापीत्यन्यत् । Similarly the *Kāś.* : न चायं भाव्यमान: किं तु आदेशान्तरनिवृत्त्यर्थं स्वरूपमेवैतदभ्यनुज्ञायते.

As compared with the statements of these other grammarians what Bhar. wants to say remains obscure. One expected आदेशान्तरप्रसङ्गो or some such expression in the place of ग्रहणप्रसङ्गो. (Even Sw's emendation उ(कारेण सवर्णा)-ग्रहणप्रसङ्गो does not help.)

(p. 38, *l.* 14) इण्ग्रहणेषु तर्हि संदेह:. This *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh.*: इण्ग्रहणेषु तर्हि संदेह: । असंदिग्धं परेण, न पूर्वेण । कुत एतत् ? 'य्वोरन्यत्र परेणेण् स्यात्' (श्लो. वा.) । यत्रेच्छति पूर्वेण, संमृद्यग्रहणं तत्र करोति, य्वोरिति । तच्च गुरु भवति । कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम् ? तत्र विभक्तिनिर्देशे संमृद्यग्रहणे चार्धचतस्रो मात्रा: । प्रत्याहारग्रहणे पुनस्तिस्रो मात्रा: । सोऽयमेवं लघीयसा न्यासेन सिद्धे सति यद् गरीयांसं यत्नमारभते, तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्य: — परेण, न पूर्वेणेति ।

Pat. interprets the Ślokavārttika to mean that when Pāṇini wants to mention *i* and *u* specifically, he uses the expression *yvoḥ* (which has $3\frac{1}{2}$ moras) in preference to *iṇaḥ* (which has 3). This preference for a longer expression (in violation of the usually respected principle of *lāghava*) indicates that he has reserved the abbreviation *iṇ* for the longer group which follows; in other words the abbreviation *iṇ* is formed with the second *ṇ* (परेण, न पूर्वेण).

One wonders whether Pat. has represented the argument of the Ślokavārttika correctly. It does not seem that the author of the Ślokavārttika is deciding the issue on the basis of *lāghavagaurava*. It appears to me that the contrast between the mention of phonemes in their own form and that by way of abbreviation is intended. When Pāṇini wants to mention *i* and *u* he does not use an abbreviation; he always utters them specifically. So, by elimination, the abbreviation is to be understood as being with the second *ṇ*.

1. स्वरूपाभ्यनुज्ञानम् = प्रतिप्रसव: (in the *Padamañjarī*).

Besides, Pat. seems to have understood *yvoḥ* of the Ślokavārttika as referring specifically to *yvoḥ* itself, e. g. the one which Pāṇini has used in अचि श्नुधातुभ्रुवां य्वोरियङुवङौ (P. 6. 4. 77). But Pāṇini may not, and cannot, always use the same expression. Thus he uses *ū* in P. 1. 4. 3 : यू स्त्र्याख्यौ नदी for *ī* and *ū*, and *vī* in P. 1. 2. 26 : रलो व्युपधाद्धलादेः संश्च for *i* and *u*. In all this, the mention of phonemes in their own form will not always be longer (*guru*) than the abbreviation.

संसृद्य — Neither Bhar. nor Kaiy. explains this word. Nāg. paraphrases it by आदेशेन तौ निवर्त्य. He obviously refers to *y* and *v* which replace *i* and *u*. Mm. Vasudevashastri Abhyankar renders it by 'समास करून' (having joined into a compound). Keeping faithful to the literal meaning one can interpret it to mean 'having broken (the group) into its individual constituents', 'taking the phonemes individually'.

(*p*. 38, *l*. 14) अत्र लाघवात् व्याप्तिर्भवति ... etc. Neither is this Bhar's explanation of the *Mbh*. satisfactory. He says that here (i. e. in the *Mbh.*) *vyāpti* is accepted on the basis of *lāghava*. Actually what Pat. has said is that Pāṇini uses *yvoḥ* to refer to *i* and *u* at the risk of *gaurava* which suggests that *iṇ* is *not* with the first *ṇ*; by elimination, it is with the second *ṇ*. So there the *lāghavagaurava* refers to the two ways of mentioning the phonemes (*i* and *u*), not to the two possibilites of the abbreviation *iṇ* — *pūrveṇa* or *pareṇa*. So actually it is the *liṅga* (using a longer expression than necessary) which decides the issue, not *lāghava*.

(*p*. 38, *l*. 15) ननु चाच्कालं व्यञ्जनकालोऽनुविधत्ते etc. An objection to the way of deciding the shortness or length of an expression by counting the moras. It was said above, for example, that the word *yvoḥ* has 3½ moras (*y*½ + *v*½ + *o* 2 + *visarga* ½). Here we count the moras of vowels and consonants separately. But, the objector says, that is objectionable. It is not, he maintains, that vowels are uttered at one time and consonants at other. The utterance of consonants synchronises with the following vowels (य एवाच्कालः स एव पूर्वभवानां व्यञ्जनानाम्). To illustrate, in our example, the duration of *yv* is the same as that of the following *o*. So the total duration should be only 2½ moras, not 3½. Bhar. dismisses the view by simply saying that this is a view of only one section of grammarians (एकीयमतमेतत्), and not a standard one.

The *Dīp*. अथ वा, क्लेशेनोच्चारणं गौरवं etc. gives another definition of *lāghava* and *gaurava*.

(*p*. 38, *l*. 17) भवत्येषा परिभाषा. The full text of the *Mbh*. represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : किं पुनर्वर्णोत्सत्ताविवार्यं णकारो द्विरनुबध्यते ? एतज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो — भवत्येषा परिभाषा 'व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि संदेहादलक्षणम्' इति ।

The *Dīp.* यद्यपि श्रोता न प्रतिपद्येत etc. comments on this. It says that though a rule may be obscure to the student, the rule itself never loses its capacity to convey a particular sense. A sympathetic and intelligent commentator can bring out the hidden meaning. The MS reading उपकथ्यते (emended to उपलभ्यते by AL) gives exactly the opposite meaning. I accept AL's emendation, only I understand an *avagraha* before शक्तिर्. The construction अशक्तिरुपलभ्यते gives exactly the intended meaning.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 37, *l.* 16) MS अत्रय; AL Sw अयं (as in the *Mbh.* Ed.) (for अत्रायं). — (2) (*p.* 37, *l.* 17) MS तैन्यायात्; Sw ते(न) न्या° (for आसत्तेर्न्या° as in AL). — (3) (*p.* 37, *ll.* 19–20) MS अग्रहणयोः (for अणुग्र°). — (4) (*p.* 37, *l.* 22) MS पदार्थाः (for पदान्ताः). — (5) (*p.* 37, *l.* 22) *Mbh.* ed. न हि प° … सन्ति. — (6) (*p.* 37, *l.* 23) MS लुङि (for लङि). — (7) (*p.* 37, *l.* 25) Sw च (for तु). — (8) (*p.* 38, *l.* 3) Sw यत्रकुत्र°. — (9) (*p.* 38, *l.* 4) *Mbh.* Ed. च इत्येवं (for एव). — (10) (*p.* 38, *l.* 5) *Mbh.* Ed. तत्र (for अवश्यं). — (11) (*p.* 38, *l.* 9) MS प्रसिद्धिरयं; Sw °रियं. — (12) (*p.* 38, *l.* 10) MS लिंगान; Sw लिंगा(त्) न. — (13) (*p.* 38, *l.* 12) Sw उ(कारेण सवर्ण)ग्रहण° (for तु ग्र°). — (14) MS निवर्तते. — (15) (*p.* 38, *l.* 15) MS याज्ञाकालं; ALSw मात्राकालं (for चाच्कालं). — (16) (*p.* 38, *l.* 16) MSSw एकायधातमेतद्; AL एकाज्धात्वर्थमेतत्, MSSw कारः (for कालः). — (17) (*p.* 38, *l.* 18) MS तमर्थं; ALSw तमर्थं. — (18) (*p.* 38, *l.* 19) MSALSw शक्तिर्. — (19) MSSw उपकथ्यते (for उपलभ्यते).

[*ña ma ṅa ṇa nam / jha bhañ* / 7, 8]

The only point discussed under this Sū. is whether the two Sū-s could not be merged together as ञमङणनझभञ् by scrapping the code-letter *m* occurring after the Sū. 7. This would reduce, the *Dīp.* remarks, the activity of speech organs from uttering two code-letters to one.[1]

[1]

Two rules P. 8. 4. 64 : हलो यमां यमि लोपः and P. 8. 3. 6 : पुमः खय्यम्परे are first taken up and it is concluded that everything will be all right if *yam* and *am* in these two rules were replaced by *yañ* and *añ* if the suggestion under the discussion is to be accepted. Then comes the rule P. 8. 3. 32 : ङमो ह्रस्वादचि ङमुण् नित्यम्.

When it is suggested that here also one could read *ṅañ* in the place of *ṅam*, the opponent objects, saying that in that case if *jh* and *bh*[2], appearing at the Pada-end, were to be followed by a word beginning with a vowel, then that vowel will have to be augmented with prefixed *jh* or *bh* (as the case may be) (*Mbh.* :

1. करणनाश is unintelligible. 2. When preceded by a short vowel.

झकारभकारयोरपि हि पदान्तयोर्झकारभकारावागमौ स्याताम्।). His fears are assuaged by saying that there is no possibility of such an eventuality inasmuch as *jh* and *bh* can never be Pada-finals (न झकारभकारौ पदान्तौ स्तः।). Still the opponent is not completely satisfied. So he continues: एवमपि पञ्चागमास्त्रय आगमिनौ वैषम्यात् संख्यातानुदेशो न प्राप्नोति. This *Mbh.* is referred to by the *pratīka* एवमपि पञ्चागमाः.

The five *āgama*-s are, as the *Dīp.* enumerates, ङ्, ण्, न्, झ् and भ् (in the technical form: ङुट्, णुट्, नुट्, झुट् and भुट्). The three *āgamin*-s are ङ्, ण् and न्[1] (झ् and भ् are ruled out as they cannot stand as Pada-finals). The difficulty now is that the usual principle of pairing off *āgama*-s and the *āgamin*-s when both are equal in number, viz. that of respectivity (P. 1. 3. 10: यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम्) cannot work. In the absence of such guiding principle, each of these three *āgamin*-s will have all the five *āgama*-s (तेनैकैकस्य पञ्च पञ्च स्युः), one after another. That is the difficulty.

(*p*. 38, 24) सन्तु तावद्येषामागमानामागमिनः. The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* runs as follows: सन्तु तावद्येषामागमानामागमिनः सन्ति। झकारभकारौ पदान्तौ न स्त इति कृत्वा आगमावपि न भविष्यतः। This *Mbh.* removes the difficulty. This simple argument is explained in a technical form in the *Dīp.* इह उद्देशानुदेशौ ... etc. This is the point made out here: The pairing off of *āgama*-s and the *āgamin*-s is done in grammar itself (and learnt when one learns grammar), and not at the time of usage. (Moreover, grammar is independent of usage.) In grammar the *āgama*-s and the *āgami*-s are equal in number and so their pairing off on the principle of respectivity is already done (शास्त्राल्लब्धयथासंख्या आगमाः) and known. Naturally, at the time of usage, the *āgama*-s proceed, each to his own *āgamin* as already fixed (यथास्वं प्रविभक्ताः). The *āgama*-s *jh* and *bh*, which in actual usage do not get their corresponding *āgamin*-s, fall out, like the odd man. Nāg. expresses the whole idea in one sentence: सिद्धान्ती तु प्रतिपत्तिकालिकमेव संख्यासाम्यं तत्प्रवृत्तौ निमित्तमित्याह — सन्त्विति।

(*p*. 38, *l*. 25): प्रयोगनिरपेक्षादेव शास्त्रात्. For this idea, cf. the *Dīp*. above (*p*. 28, *l*. 27) ... ज्ञानाङ्गं शास्त्रम् (as against प्रयोगाङ्गं शास्त्रम् *p*. 29, *l*. 15) इत्यस्मिन् दर्शने. The present case of the *āgama*-s *jh* and *bh* is also cited there: यथोक्तम् — झकारभकारौ पदान्तौ न स्तः इति झुट्-भुटौ न भविष्यत इति.

I reconstruct the MS शास्त्र ... ... संख्यागमाः as शास्त्राल्लब्धयथासंख्या आगमाः. In the sentence झभावागमिनौ न स्तः etc. झभौ and आगमिनौ are not *samānādhikaraṇa*. The construction is: आगमिनौ न स्तः इति [आगमौ] झभौ न प्रवर्तेते.

(*p*. 38, *l*. 27) चोदनायाश्चाभावात् पुनर्ङणनेषु न प्रवर्तेते. This *Dīp.*, rather corrupt in the MS., answers a possible question. If in the first round *jh* and *bh* fall out, let them. But why do they not subsequently compete with *ṅ*, *ṇ* and *n*

1. Strictly, vowels preceded by (1) *ṅ*, (2) *ṇ* and (3) (*n*).

and claim their *āgamin*-s alternately ? The reply is given on the view that there is no repetition of an injunction. (चोदनायाः अभावात्. Here चोदना = पुनश्चोदना). This principle also is mentioned in the *Dīp.* just cited above in the form : सकृल्लक्षणं प्रवृत्तम् (*p.* 28, *l.* 26) (as against असकृल्लक्षणं प्रवर्तते [*p.* 29, *l.* 15]).

(*p.* 39, *l.* 1) एतद्व्याख्यानेनैव etc. This sentence, which actually occurs in the MS. as the first sentence in Āhnika III, properly belongs here. See Notes to the Crit. Ed. Āhnika III, p. 41. As pointed out there, *nava* is a mistake for *ṣaṭ*.

[2]

अथ किमिदमक्षरमिति. The following two Ślokavārttikas are commented on the *Mbh.* here :

अक्षरं न क्षरं विद्यादश्नोतेर्वा सरोऽक्षरम् ।
वर्णं वाहुः पूर्वसूत्रे किमर्थमुपदिश्यते ॥
वर्णज्ञानं वाग्विषयो यत्र च ब्रह्म वर्तते ।
तदर्थमिष्टबुद्ध्यर्थं लघ्वर्थं चोपदिश्यते ॥

केषांचिद्वर्णोऽक्षरम् etc. Before beginning to explain the *Mbh.* the *Dīp.* volunteers an observation on the concept of *akṣara.* It says that according to some it is a phonetic concept. *Akṣara* means a phoneme, a speech-sound (= a *varṇa*). According to others it is a semantic concept. It means a Pada or a Vākya.

इदं चोक्तम् etc. This is apparently to justify the act of explanation of the term *akṣara* here. The occasion is provided by the *Mbh.* [I. 3. 12] which reads यो वा इमां स्वरशोऽक्षरशः ... etc. while listing the utilities of the study of grammar. Kaiy. adds, more pertinently, the reason that the alphabet, whose critical study is just over, is called Akṣarasamāmnāya.

(*p.* 39, *l.* 4) अक्षरं न क्षरं विद्यात् . Akṣara is what is not *kṣara* ' perishable, destructible '. When the *Dīp.* says क्रियाशब्दः, it lays stress on its derivational meaning. The meaning, it suggests, is based on the action (*kriyā*) denoted by the verb which is at its root. *Akṣara* is a *kriyāśabda* like the well-known word *pācaka* ' one who cooks '.

Incidentally, the MS reading अपाचक (retained in AL; emended to अवाचक by Sw) is corrupt. It should be पाचक (which is a standard example of a *kriyāśabda*).

न क्षरति न क्षीयते ... etc. The *Dīp.* thinks that Pat. advances another paraphrase : न क्षीयते as having a well-known meaning (*prasiddhārtham*) in contrast to the first one : न क्षरति which it thought was probably not clear enough (*aprasiddha*).

(*p.* 39, *l.* 6) यथा क्षण: क्षणोते: etc.

The MS reading प्रक्षत: (retained in AL) is emended to प्रक्ष्णुत: in Sw and is also accepted here. The MS दक्तेति: (AL क्षरति:) is unintelligible. It is probably to be emended to क्षणोति: as Sw does or better to क्ष्णौति:. The whole is a citation from the *Nīr*. 2. 25. The *Dīp*. quotes it under P. 1. 1. 6 : दीधीवेवीटाम् also.

(*p.* 39. *l.* 8) अश्नोतेर्वा सरोऽक्षरम्. Another derivation, from $\sqrt{}$*aś* + *sara(n)* 'pervading'. The pervasion is with reference to meaning. So 'meaningful'. So it denotes a Pada or a Vākya.

(*p.* 39, *l.* 10) वर्णं वाहु: पूर्वसूत्रे. नामधेय is a conventional word without a derivational meaning; a mere name (= *varṇa* here). Cf. Kaiy. : रूढिरियं वर्णस्य । व्याकरणान्तरे 'वर्णा अक्षराणि' इति वचनात् ।

(*p.* 39, *l.* 12) With the *Dīp.* न हि वर्णानां साधुत्वं etc., cf. Kaiy. : वर्णानां साधुत्वस्याप्रतिपाद्यमानत्वात पदस्यैव साधुत्वान्वाख्यानात् प्रश्न: । Actually the topic किमर्थो वर्णानामुपदेश: has been already discussed (probably as an introduction to the Āhnika II) towards the end of the Paspaśāhnika, from वृत्तिसमवायार्थ उपदेश: *Vār*. 15 onwards [I. 13. 1 ff.].

(*p.* 39, *l.* 14) वर्णज्ञानं वाग्विषय:. It is to be noted that Bhar. explains *-jñāna* in the sense of 'means of knowledge', in the present case, grammar. Similarly *viṣaya* is taken to mean a location or place where something is bound together. Grammar is thus the *viṣaya* of speech (rather topsyturveyed from the normal point of view). But similarly Kaiy. too : वर्णा येन शास्त्रेण ज्ञायन्ते तद् वाचो विषय: । शास्त्रेण वाग् विसीयते = आबध्यते, शास्त्रेण तस्या: परिज्ञानादित्यर्थ: ।

(*p.* 39, *l.* 16) यत्र च ब्रह्म वर्तते. Following Bhar., Kaiy. also understands *brahma* in the sense of Veda and thinks that the clause यत्र च ब्रह्म वर्तते refers to Pada. Grammar is its *viṣaya*. Read : ब्रह्म वेद:, पदे वर्तते । तस्य च शास्त्रं विषय: । लौकिकानां वैदिकानां च शास्त्रं विषय इत्यर्थ: ।

The MS reads यदेतस्य वर्णस्य शास्त्रं ... We have to emend यदे to पदे in view of Kaiy. (Sw's emendation of क in the preceding sentence to पदे, however, is most fanciful and uncalled for.) Of course it is difficult to explain *varṇasya* (instead of *padasya*) which follows. But that may have been said so on the view : वर्णसंघात: पदम्.

(*p.* 39, *l.* 18) तदर्थम्. The *Dīp*. says that *tad* refers to *varṇajñāna*. So तदर्थम् = वर्णज्ञानार्थम् = शास्त्रार्थम् 'for the sake of grammar'. It is also pointed out that the Ślokavārttikakāra is saying the same thing what the 'Vākyakāra' (= Vārttikakāra, Kātyāyana) said in his *Vār*. 15 in the Paspaśā.

(*p*. 39, *l*. 24) सोऽयमक्षरसमाम्नायो वाक्समाम्नायः. The *Dīp*. suggests that the *Mbh*. here identifies the Akṣaras. with the speech itself : speech activity is nothing but just this alphabet. — (*l*. 25) Kaiy. copies verbatim Bhar. in explaining पुष्पितः फलितश्च by दृष्टादृष्टफलाभ्यामभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसाभ्याम् . — (*p*. 40 *l*. 1) चन्द्रतारकवत् प्रतिमण्डितः. The ccmmon property between the linguistic usage and the heavenly bodies is that both are eternal, in the sense that their originator is not known. Both have simply been there from times immemorial. — Incidentally, स्मर्यमाणम्, Nominative in such a grammatical context, is violatim of P. 3. 2. 124 : लटः शतृशानचावप्रथमासमानाधिकरणे.— (*l*. 3) ब्रह्मराशिः, i. e. the Veda, or the Śabdabrahman. Although two letters are illegible (and AL read समुद्धूतक्रमः), Sw is probably right in inferring संहृतक्रमः as the original text. (*l*. 6) मृतयोः. Scil. मातापित्रोः.

Colophon. प्रत्याहाराः = प्रत्याहारसूत्राणि.

Readings : (1) (*p*. 38, *l*. 25) MSSw शास्त्र ... संख्यागयाः; AL शास्त्रात् यथासंख्यागमाः (for शास्त्राल्लब्धयथासंख्या आगमाः). — (2) (*p*. 38, *l*. 26) Sw यथा संप्र° (for यथास्वं प्र°). — (3) Sw उभाव् (for झभाव्). See Notes. — (4) (*p*. 38, *l*. 27) MS Sw प्रवर्तंते; AL तन्ते (for the first प्रवर्तंते).—(5) MS Sw च—वात्; AL च भावात् (for चाभा°). — (6) AL च (for न). — (7) MS AL प्रवर्तंते; Sw तन्ते (for the second प्रवर्तंते). — (8) (*p*. 39, *l*. 4) MS AL अपाचक; Sw अवाचक (for पाचक). — (9) (*p*. 39, *l*. 5) *Mbh*. Ed. इति वा (for इत्यतो). — (10) (*p*. 39, *l*. 6) MS AL प्रक्षत: (for प्रक्ष्णुतः). — (11) (*p*. 39, *l*. 7) MS दक्तेतिः (?); AL क्षरतिः (for क्ष्णौतिः as in Sw). — (12) Sw क्षयकर्मेति. — (13) (*p*. 39, *l*. 9) AL येन (for तेन).—(14) (*p*. 39, *l*. 11) MS अन्ये वा पठ्यंते; AL अन्यैर्वा पठ्यते; Sw अन्यैः पठ्यते. — (15) (*p*. 39, *l*. 12) MS प्रतिपाद्य; AL °पाद्यते (for °पाद्यम् as in Sw). — (16) (*p*. 39, *l*. 15) MS Sw विसी(MS °सा)यते. — (17) (*p*. 39, *l*. 16) Sw (प)दे (!) (for क्व). — (18) (*p*. 39, *l*. 17) MS AL Sw यद्देतस्य (for पदे । तस्य). — (19) (*p*. 39, *l*. 21) MS निवृत्तिकालादिकान्; AL °त्तकलादिकाम् . — (20) (*p*. 40, *l*. 3) MS सझद्ध(?)त°; AL समुद्धूत° (for संहृत° as in Sw). — (21) AL drop the doubtful शः. — (22) (*p*. 40, *l*. 4) AL शक्यो. — (23) (*p*. 40, *l*. 5) MS Sw कृते कृतस्य; AL कृतस्य (for कृते तस्य).

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page 2, *line* 10 : Perhaps आश्रावणार्थम् was the original reading.

Page 8, *line* 22 : *for* पङ्क्तावस्थित, *read* पङ्क्ताववस्थित.

Page 9, *line* 28 : *for* इहाकाशम्, *read* इहाकाशमिहाकाशम्.

Page 18, *line* 16 : After औङ् इति तदेकदेशस्येति, insert the following two paragraphs :

यस्य द्वौ तपरौ स पर्यनुयुज्यते, कथमितरयोस्तपरत्वमिति । स आह — तादपि परस्तपर इति । ननु च नात्राद्याप्येतदवतिष्ठते, आतश्च नावतिष्ठते, यद् वक्ष्यत्युत्तरत्र । नैष दोषः । स्थितमपि पुनः पुनः स्थपतिवद् उपन्यस्यते । यथैतदेव पुनर् ‘ वृद्धिरादैच् ’ (पा. १. १. १) इति वक्ष्यति तदप्येव । तस्मात् प्रतिज्ञाभेदमात्रमेव, सर्वाणि वा तपराणि, द्वे वा तपरे इति ।

अथ किमर्थम् ‘ अतो भिस ऐस् ’ (पा. ७. १. ९) इति प्रत्याहारो न भवति संध्यक्षरे तकारे, यथा अचीति ? किं स्वित् स्यात् ? अग्निभिर्वायुभिर्गोभिर्नौभिरित्यैस्भावः स्यात् । अथ कस्मात् स्वरूपग्रहणं न भवति ? किं च स्यात् ? भवद्भिरित्यैस्भावः स्यात् । अथ व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्, इहापि तपरोऽयमिति व्याख्यास्यामः ।

(The translation and notes on this passage are in their proper place.)

Page 20, *line* 24 : *for* -ओकारौ, *read* -औकारौ.

Page 81, *line* 27 : *for* Nipātona, *read* Nipātana.

Page 120, *line* 3 : *for* sound, *read* second.

Page 146, *line* 9 : *for* °यंप्राप्नोति, *read* °व्यं प्राप्नोति.

Page 207, *line* 34 : *for* will, *read* will,.

Page 212, *line* 2 : *for* °प्राप्यर्थं, *read* °प्राप्त्यर्थं.

Page 218, *line* 12 : *for* 21, *read* 22.

Page 231, *line* 34 : *for* उच्चारया°, *read* उच्चारय°.

Page 249, *line* 14 : *for* listner, *read* listener.

Page 273, *lines* 7 and 10 : *for* द्युपसर्गात्, *read* द्व्युपसर्गात्.

Page 274, *line* 8 : *for* Ifn, *read* If.

Page 274, *line* 21 : *Interchange* role *and* rule.

Page 280, *line* 36 : *for* initials element, *read* initial elements.

Page 301, *line* 17 : *for* noli, *read* only.

Page 302, *line* 30 : *for* प्राप्नोति, *read* प्राप्नोति.

Page 305, *line* 19 : *for* सज्ँयन्ता, *read* सय्ँयन्ता.

Read the Text references at the top as :

Page	*For*	*Read*
241	24. 5	24. 25
242	24. 2	25. 2
243	24. 14	26. 1
244	23. 60	26. 2
245	24. 1	26. 7
246	24. 15	26. 8
247	23. 25	26. 12
248	24. 5	26. 13
249	23. 2	26. 29
250	23. 10	27. 1

ABBREVIATIONS

AL	=	Abhyankar and Limaye
Bhar.	=	Bhartṛhari
Dīp.	=	*Dīpikā*
Kaiy.	=	Kaiyaṭa
Kāś.	=	*Kāśikā*
Kāt.	=	Kātyāyana
Mbh.	=	*Mahābhāṣya*
MS.	=	Manuscript
Nāg.	=	Nāgeśa, Nāgojibhaṭṭa
NS	=	*Nyāya-Sūtra*
P.	=	Pāṇini
Padam.	=	*Padamañjarī*
P. Dh.	=	Pāṇinīya Dhātupāṭha
Pari.	=	*Paribhāṣā*
Pat.	=	Patañjali
Prad.	=	*Pradīpa*
Sid-Kau.	=	*Siddhānta-Kaumudī*
Sw	=	Swaminathan
Vār.	=	*Vārttika*
कै.	=	कैयट
ना.	=	नागेश, नागोजिभट्ट
सि. कौ.	=	सिद्धान्तकौमुदी